

Volume I.

New Series

Number 2

*Church News*

THE

AMERICAN

# PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH: J. M. SHERWOOD.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary, N. Y.

---

APRIL, 1869.

---

NEW YORK:

**J. M. SHERWOOD, 65-1 BROADWAY.**

(At the Book Store of Messrs. CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOK STORE, 1234 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.

AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY General Agents.

# HOURS AT HOME.

New Volume. Fifth Year.

THE MAY number will begin the Ninth Volume and the Fifth Year of HOURS AT HOME. Our arrangements for the New Year secure increased interest, value, and variety in the contents of the Magazine. Among the papers which will appear in the May and following numbers will be:

Prof. Noah Porter's valuable Series on "Books and Reading," Continued.

"Motherless Girls," by the author of "Mary Powell," completed in the June number, and a new and highly interesting Serial begun in July.

"Christopher Kroy," by the author of "Storm-Cliff," will be continued.

Highly interesting papers by the United States Consul-General of Syria on "The Sources of the Jordan," "The Lake and the River of Palestine," "The Bedouin Arabs," "A Summer in Mount Lebanon," "Races and Religions of the East," "Education in Syria," "A Day on the Other Side of Jordan," etc.

"The Russian Peasant," and other papers on Russia, by the United States Consul at Moscow.

Articles on Popular Science, by Prof. DE VERE.

Interesting Essays on "The Romances of Arthur," their Origin and Growth, their Influence on Society, and their Influence on English Literature, by Prof. A. J. CURTIS.

Papers on Various Topics, by Prof. E. P. EVANS, of the University of Michigan.

Translations of the Choicest Papers found in the Foreign Magazines.

"The Palais Royal," "The Ruins of Clisson," and other valuable descriptive papers from G. M. TOWLE.

"Palestine Explorations," "History of the Jesuit Missions in China," "Yale College One Hundred Years Ago," "The Irish System of Prison Discipline," "Neander's Last Birth-Day," "Money Matters and Matrimony," "Gottfried August Bürger," by S. S. CONANT; "Church Building," "Recent Geographical Discoveries in Africa," "The Laws of Hereditary Descent," by Dr. G. M. BEARD; "The Paradise of Old Sailors," "The Cannibals of Equatorial West Africa," by Rev. ALBERT BUSINELL. "A Day with a Roman Gentleman," "Tenant Houses," by C. L. BRACE, "Voices of the Spring," by RAY PALMER, and a large number of other articles on a great variety of topics, by some of the best writers of the day.

Poems, by "H. H.," Howard Glyndon, Mrs. Hinsdale, Mary Barker Dodge, Miss Pollard, Carl Spencer, Helen Brown, Gilmore Simms, C. H. A. Bulkley, A. D. F. Randolph, and others.

Notes of Travel, Short Stories, and Miscellaneous Papers, by various writers.

"Books and Authors Abroad" will continue to keep our readers posted up in the matter of new books in the Old World.

Increased space and attention will be given to "Leisure Moments" and "Literature of the Day," making them still more attractive and valuable features of the Magazine.

## NOW IS A FAVORABLE TIME TO SUBSCRIBE,

TO RENEW SUBSCRIPTIONS, AND FORM CLUBS FOR ANOTHER YEAR.

While the offer of Premiums for single subscribers was withdrawn on the first of January, we still continue to offer any of our \$1.50 premiums to any old subscriber sending us \$6 to pay for two years in advance. And any person on sending one new subscription and renewing his own for one year, will be entitled to that beautiful Chromo, "Home in the Hedge."

## Wheeler & Wilson's Sewing Machine.

For twenty Subscriptions with \$60, we are still able to offer this unrivalled Machine; price, \$55. Make up your Club and send on the names at the earliest moment practicable.

TERMS—\$3 a year: \$5 for two years: Clergymen \$2.50.

CLUBBING RATES—Hours at Home and Harper's Monthly, Weekly, or Bazar, or Hearth and Home, for \$5.50, regular price, \$7; Hours at Home and Eclectic, \$6.50; or Living Age, \$9, price \$11. Hours at Home and American Presbyterian Review, \$6; or Princeton Review, \$8. The two Reviews and Hours at Home, \$8.50.

With the May Number a Series of Country Papers, entitled "SUNNYBANK PAPERS," by "MAHON HARLAND," will be begun, and will be continued in each number of the volume.



# The American Presbyterian Review.

NEW SERIES.—NUMBER II.

CONTENTS OF THE APRIL NUMBER, 1869.

	PAGE.
ART. I.—RECENT DISCOVERIES IN GEOLOGY. THE AQUEOUS FORMATION OF GRANITE AND CONSEQUENT REVOLU- TION IN GEOLOGY.....	213
By Rev. ROBERT PATTERSON, D. D., Chicago, Ill.	
II.—THE REFORMED OR CALVINISTIC SENSE.....	241
By E. D. MORRIS, D. D., Professor in Lane Theological Seminary, Ohio.	
III.—BIBLICAL PREACHING.....	265
By J. B. CONDIT, D. D., Professor in Auburn Theologi- cal Seminary.	
IV.—PRES. WHELOCK AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES..	281
By E. H. GILLET, D. D., New York.	
V.—PROGRESS OF THE REUNION MOVEMENT.....	304
By Rev. J. G. MONFORT, D. D., Cincinnati, O.	
VI.—THE INCARNATION, AND THE SYSTEM WHICH STANDS UPON IT.....	324
By R. S. STORRS, Jr., D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	
VII.—MR. MILL AND HIS CRITICS.....	351
By FRANCIS BOWEN, Professor in Harvard University.	
VIII.—AN "OLD SIDE" PLEA FOR REUNION.....	375
By Rev. F. ALISON, D. D.	
IX.—RECENT GERMAN BOOKS.....	401
By C. A. BRIGGS, Berlin, Prussia.	
X.—NOTES ON BOOKS.....	407
BIBLICAL LITERATURE: The Roman Edition of the <i>Co- dex Vaticanus</i> —Tischendorf's <i>Appendix Novi Testamenti Vaticani</i> —Eadie's Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle to the Galatians—Lillie's Lectures on the Epis- tles of Peter—Winer's Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament—Abbott's Life and Teachings of Jesus of Nazareth—Dodge's Evidences of Christianity.....	407
CHURCH HISTORY AND THEOLOGY: Ante-Nicene Chris- tian Library—Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit —Squier's Being of God and Moral Government.....	412
SCIENCE AND HISTORY: The Duke of Argyll's Primeval Man—Baldwin's Pre-Historic Nations—Alex. Müller's Chips from a German Workshop—Dean's History of Civilization—Nevius' China and the Chinese—Gage's Historical Atlas.....	413
PRACTICAL RELIGION: Liddon's Sermons before the University of Oxford—Bickersteth's Hades and Heaven —Ker's Sermons.....	418

<b>ART. XI—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..</b>	<b>419</b>
GERMANY.....	419
FRANCE.....	423
GREAT BRITAIN.....	423
RUSSIA.....	424

### EDITOR'S NOTE.

WE need to offer no apology to our readers for the course which this REVIEW has taken in reference to the great question of Reunion, which is agitating the two chief branches of the Presbyterian Church, nor for the space which we have given to articles bearing upon this subject. Our earnest wish has been to see this union accomplished, believing that the honor of religion demands it, and that the power of the Presbyterian Church for good would thereby be greatly advanced. We believe the desirable day is now nigh at hand, and that it will be no longer necessary for us to give prominence to discussions having immediate reference to this object. We have reason to know that the course we have pursued on this great question has met with the decided approval and appreciation of the great majority in both branches of our denomination, and we share, with many others, in the profound regret that our Editorial Associate—Prof. HENRY B. SMITH, whose services have been so efficient—should at this juncture be prostrated by overwork and compelled to seek rest and recuperation in foreign lands.

So much timely and excellent matter from the pens of many of our ablest writers was at our command for the present number, that, after exceeding our limits 16 pages, we had no space for articles from the Foreign Reviews, and were also obliged to defer much of our Intelligence, and Notes on Books. We reproduce, however, in this department, the noble and eminently timely Sermon of Dr. Alison, preached on a memorable occasion more than a century since, and which will be new to most of our readers. In our next issue we shall give some important articles, some of them translations from the German and French, from the Foreign Reviews.

J. M. SHERWOOD.

### BUSINESS NOTE.

THE AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW contains more matter than any other Theological Review published in this country. It corps of contributors embraces many of our ablest and most distinguished review writers, representing the various branches of the Christian Church. While it is conducted in the interest of Presbyterians, it is the organ of no sect or school, and seeks, as its chief end, to advance the cause of Christian Learning.

TERMS: \$3.50 in advance. Single numbers \$1. All Missionaries, Theological Students, and Young Men's Christian Associations, \$3. For \$6 the REVIEW and HOURS AT HOME; or for 3 new subscriptions to HOURS AT HOME, with \$9, the REVIEW will be sent for one year.

Address

J. M. SHERWOOD,  
(Care C. SCRIBNER & Co.,) 654 Broadway, New York

THE  
AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN  
REVIEW.

---

THIRD SERIES. No. II.—APRIL, 1869.

---

ART. I.—RECENT DISCOVERIES IN GEOLOGY.

THE AQUEOUS FORMATION OF GRANITE AND CONSEQUENT REVOLUTION IN GEOLOGY.

By Rev. ROBERT PATTERSON, D. D., Chicago, Ill.

It is the custom of a certain class of writers to contrast religion, as a mere collection of speculative opinions, with science, and especially with geological science, as consisting of a body of well-ascertained facts. They argue the necessary conquest of faith by science, and the substitution of Murchison for Moses, and of Lyell for Christ, on the ground of superior authority. But this flippant contrast displays no profound acquaintance with either religion or science. For religion consists, not merely of dogmas, but of a body of facts, well-ascertained, in the very same way as the facts of science are ascertained, by the observation of competent observers, and the experiments of inquirers, and believed on the very same grounds on which all science is believed, namely, on the testimony of the observers. There is not one of our readers who has any other basis of belief for his A, B, C, or for any subsequent acquisition in geography, astronomy, geology, or any other science, than faith in the testimony of his teachers.

On the other hand, science does not consist in the knowledge of a heterogeneous collection of facts, but in an arrangement of facts according to a system or theory. The greater

the number of the facts the wider the theory needed to accommodate them. The more numerous the pearls the longer the string required for the necklace. The consequence is, that scientific theories are necessarily continually changing, and the history of science is the history of the birth, growth, death and burial of successive theories, each of which, in its turn, assumed the name of science, but is now the laughing stock of a wiser generation. Newton and Bacon studied astrology with all seriousness. The Ptolemaic astronomy was accepted as science for a millennium. Our current geology is not yet fifty years old, yet already the grave is dug for the modern theory; the leaders of science declare the theory utterly inadequate to account for recently discovered facts, and pronounce the so-called science simply fiction.

Geology may be briefly defined as the science of world-making. It is by no means content with a classification of facts; every lecturer and author sets out with a cosmogony. The prevailing cosmogony makes the world out of molten metals. Thus the state geologist of Illinois: "Geology is that department of natural science which treats of the earth's structure and development; and it carries us back, through a regular sequence of cause and effect, to a period when the material of which it was composed existed in a state of liquid fusion; or, in other words, when the earth was a globe of liquid fire. The radiation of heat from the surface resulted in the gradual cooling of the mass, and thus the first rocks were formed, as modern igneous rocks are now formed, by the cooling of mineral matter ejected from existing volcanoes."<sup>\*</sup> In the same strain, only more modestly, Buckland begins his explanations: "*Assuming that the whole materials of our globe may have once been in a fluid, or even in a nebular, state, from the presence of intense heat, the passage of the first consolidated portions of this fluid or nebulous matter to a solid state, may have been produced by the radiation of heat from its surface into space; the gradual abstraction of such heat would allow the particles of matter to approach and crystallize; and the*

---

<sup>\*</sup> *Geological Survey of Illinois*, p. 10.

first result of this crystallization *might* have been the formation of a shell or crust composed of oxidated metals and metalloids, constituting various rocks of the granite series, around one incandescent nucleus of melted matter heavier than granite."<sup>6</sup> This is a candid confession that the whole affair is only a hypothesis, a mere assumption. But the third-rate geologists are quite positive and clear, upon second-hand reading, of the certainty of that which Buckland, Phillips, Lyell and Macculloch acknowledge to be merely a hypothesis. This is generally the case; second-hand science is the genuine, positive philosophy. We have before us now a shilling school-book, which gives us a three inch map of the whole affair; the mountains projecting from the sphere like the teeth of a circular saw; the hundred miles depth, below which Wedgewood's fire-clay pyrometer melts, marked with a dark band, and the fused interior left white; the whole very like the section of a sucked orange. At the Artesian well you may see the paintings, on a large scale, of the whole process as seen in vision by a spirit seer. Every geological lecturer sets out with a full and particular account of the whole operation, as seen in geological vision. It was some such clear view of the visions of geology which upset the faith of C. W. Goodwin, M. A., and his fellow Essayists, in Moses' cosmogony. He tells us that, "The first clear view which we obtain of the early condition of the earth presents to us a ball of matter, fluid with intense heat, spinning on its own axis, and revolving around the sun. How long it may have continued in this state is beyond calculation or surmise. It can only be believed that a prolonged period, beginning and ending we know not when, elapsed before the surface became cooled and hardened and capable of organized existence. The water, which now inwraps a large portion of the face of the globe, must for ages have existed only in the shape of steam, floating above and enveloping the planet in one thick curtain of mist. When the cooling of the surface allowed it to condense and descend, there commenced the process by which the lowest stratified rocks were formed

---

\* Hitchcock's *Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 40.

and gradually spread out in vast layers. Rains and rivers now acted upon the scoriaceous integument grinding it down to sand and carrying it down to the depths and cavities.”\*

The object of giving this full and particular account of the “clear view” which geology gives them of the process of world-making, is to enable the essayist and his friends to show its utter contradiction to the Mosaic account of creation. He accordingly goes over the first chapter of Genesis, and gives his exposition of its meaning (the old Voltairean perversion), and sums up thus: “That this meaning is, *prima facie*, one wholly adverse to the present astronomical and geological views of the universe is obvious enough. There is not a mere difference through deficiency. It can not be correctly said that the Mosaic writer simply leaves out details which modern science supplies, and that therefore the inconsistency is not a real but only an apparent one. It is manifest that the whole account is given from a different point of view from that which we now unavoidably take,” etc.† This is a very fair specimen of this style of geological attack on the Bible. Some of our American writers are more scurrilous.

It has been customary for Christians to deny this charge of the contradiction of Scripture by science, by alleging that the Bible teaches no system of geology. The ancient Hebrew interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, twenty centuries ago, before geology was dreamt of, is, that the first verse describes the original and most ancient creation of the substance of heaven and earth; the second verse an indefinite period of chaos, and subsequent development under the wings of the brooding spirit; and then with the six days’ work the arrangement of the earth’s surface, and of the visible heavens for man’s accommodation. Until modern Europeans and Americans shall prove themselves more competent Hebraists than the men who interpreted their own mother tongue, this exegesis will stand; and with it the refusal of the Author of the Bible to commit himself to any scientific theory. But the question of the agreement or disagreement of the Bible with

---

\* *Essays and Reviews*, p. 240.† *Ibid*, p. 251.



our current theory of igneous geology need not any longer concern us, since the discoveries of the last seven years have shown the error of the fundamental assumption of the whole system.

In proceeding to notice the strictly geological discoveries bearing upon the subject, it is proper to refer to those in the kindred science of astronomy connected with it : for all science is one, and it is not the least conclusive part of the evidence that the concurrent testimony of several sciences all bears against the igneous notion of geology. This notion is held as a part of what is known as the Development Theory, which has recently been utterly exploded. When we ask geologists how their globe became so wonderfully red-hot and molten, they refer us to La Place's notion, as revived and expounded by Spencer and the Positive School, that the universe originated in an immense cloud of homogeneous gas, at a heat capable of holding all metals in vapor, which cooled down into molten globes. But in a previous lecture we have seen the testimony of Sir John Herschel, and other eminent astronomers, that this notion receives no support from the facts of the solar system, but is contradicted by the number, variety, distances, and densities of the planets : his exposure of Comte's pretended calculation of a correspondence between the theory and the times of their revolutions, and Spencer's failure in his bungling attempt to reconstruct the hypothesis, by reversing La Place's original idea of condensation by the cooling of a hot fire-mist, into the heating up of a cold nebula by condensation. We examined also the two fundamental postulates of the theory—eternally existing homogeneous matter in a nebulous state, and eternal self-originated motion ; and saw that both these assumptions are proved impossible by the two recent discoveries of the Correlation of Forces, and of Spectrum Analysis. The doctrine of the Correlation of Forces, by reducing all chemical, electric, and magnetic forces to their equivalents of mechanical power, reduces all astronomical movements to the domain of the laws of mechanics, and particularly to the law that action and reaction are equal ; and so no machine can originate, or eternally maintain, motion. The nebular

theory is therefore only the proposal of the exploded Perpetual Motion on a large scale. The Spectroscope, displaying the flames of the nebulae as composed of several gases, dissipates the notion of the existence of homogeneous matter. No combination can be eternal. The removal of the Nebular Theory takes away the astronomical origin of our igneous globe.

The logical basis of this igneous nucleus notion will not bear examination. The only ascertained fact relied upon for its support, is the gradual increase of terrestrial heat as we descend into mines, for the very short distance we can penetrate the earth. From this it is inferred that the same ratio of increase of temperature toward the centre prevails in the impenetrable depths, under unknown and totally different conditions of gravity, pressure, conduction, and electro-magnetism. It would be equally logical to reverse the inference, and argue that as atmospheric temperature diminishes in the sunshine, in the tropics, from the sea level to the snow line,  $18^{\circ}$  for every mile of ascent from the earth's surface, therefore the temperature of space one hundred millions of miles from the earth's mountain tops is not less than  $1,800,000,000^{\circ}$  below zero.

Sir John Herschel gives an illustration of the argument which has all the force of a *reductio ad absurdum*: "Now only consider what sort of a conclusion this lands us in. This globe of ours is 8,000 miles in diameter: a mile deep on its surface is a mere scratch. If a man had twenty great-coats on, and I found under the first a warmth of  $60^{\circ}$  above the external air, I should expect to find 60 more under the second, and 60 more under the third, and within all, no man, but a mass of red-hot iron. Just so with the outside crust of the earth. Every mile thick is such a great-coat, and at twenty miles depth, according to this rate, the ground must be fully red-hot," etc.\* This is not written in ridicule of the theory; though there is not a boy in Chicago, on a wintry day, who would not laugh at the notion of finding himself red-hot upon stripping off his coat, vest, etc., because while the air is at zero, the temperature under his great-coat is  $60^{\circ}$  Fahren.

---

\* *Familiar Lectures*, II.

The next objection to the "clear view" of the igneous nucleus is, that we can not get any consistent view of it at all, neither past nor present. We can not get any agreement among our philosophers either as to its present condition or size, much less as to its former heat. The time necessary for our earth to cool down from its molten condition to a state fit for plants to grow, has been accurately determined by M. Unger, from experiments on the cooling of basalt, at nine millions of years; but M. Hibert, with equal accuracy, fixes it at five millions, and M. Bove, with equal certainty, at three hundred and fifty millions. The period which has elapsed since, is fixed with scientific certainty by each geologist to suit his own taste. Poisson, however, alleges that the heat of the earth is merely a consequence of the motion of our planetary system in space; of which some parts have more stellar heat than others. He denies that the centre of the earth is any hotter than the surface; alleging that, even on the hypothesis of a molten cooling globe, the solid parts first cooled would sink to the centre.\*

The same want of agreement as to the rate of increase of the terrestrial heat, prevails between the observers in different localities. The mean rate in six of the deepest English mines is  $1^{\circ}$  for every forty-four feet. In the silver and lead mines of Saxony it was found to be  $1^{\circ}$  Farenh. for every sixty-five feet; but in other mines it was necessary to descend three times as far for each degree of temperature. Mr. Fox, in the Dalwath mine in Cornwall, found the increase  $1^{\circ}$  for seventy-five feet. Kupfer gives the result of his researches as  $1^{\circ}$  for every thirty-seven feet. Cordier asserts that the rate varies in different countries, averaging  $1^{\circ}$  Fahren. for every forty-five feet. At the experimental well of Grenelle, it was found to be  $1^{\circ}$  Fahr. for every sixty feet, at a depth of thirteen hundred and twelve feet.† Such discordant results can not proceed from one uniform cause. They point, not to one central and uniform, but to many local and various, sources of heat.

There is also a little difference of opinion about the heat of

---

\* *Cosmos*, I. 165.

† Lyell's *Elements of Geology*, chap. xxxi.

the sea of fire within, and consequently about the thickness of the solid crust which we call our real estate. It was alleged by some that, as we find the heat increase a degree for every fifty-seven feet we sink into the earth, it must be hot enough at twenty-four miles to melt cast-iron. Lyell gives the depth in miles; but Humboldt, a man of correct measurement, gives it in feet—121,500. This melting point of iron, however, strange to say, is quite as undetermined as the rest of the business; according to Wedgewood's pyrometer, which was the infallible standard twenty years ago, it was  $21,000^{\circ}$  Fahren.; but Prof. Daniels has constructed another infallible instrument which says  $2,786^{\circ}$  Fahren. exactly; while, in the meantime, Messrs. St. Clair, Deville and Troaste have invented a new instrument which alleges that at  $1530^{\circ}$  C. copper and silver are vaporized.\* This would make a slight difference in the thickness of the crust, which in the one case would be twenty-four, and in the other two hundred miles thick. But Hopkins comes in and demonstrates that with any such pressure of superheated steam or gas, two hundred miles of half-melted granite would explode faster than a steamboat boiler of stove-pipe iron; and he demands at least eight hundred or a thousand miles of good solid rock. Having measured and weighed the earth and the stars by the pendulum, he alleges we have a good title, for our city lots at least, a thousand miles down.†

The notion of this fluid nucleus at an enormous temperature is contrary to all known properties of melting bodies. Cordier calculates the interior heat at  $450,000^{\circ}$  Fahren., or about one hundred and sixty times that of melted iron. But it is well known to be impossible to raise the temperature of water much above the melting point, while a piece of ice remains floating in it. Every foundryman knows that the same principle prevails in melting metals; the temperature can not be raised above the melting point while a pig of lead is floating in the crucible. A sea of boiling water at  $212^{\circ}$  Fahren., covered with a crust of ice twenty-four miles, or eight hundred miles, thick, at  $32^{\circ}$  Fahren., would be a dream six hun-

\**Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1867. †Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, p. 538.

dred times less preposterous than a sea of molten minerals, at 450,000° Fahrenheit, floating a solid crust at less than 100° Fahren. The alleged phenomena of the solidifying of a crust or cooling lava are irrelevant, since the proportion of cooling surface to the mass is so immensely different. The state of lava in the crater during an eruption is the correct illustration, and it speedily melts all extraneous substances.

So weighty do these objections and contradictions seem even to Spencer that he is obliged to give up the molten nucleus notion and fill the hollow sphere with gas. "Irreconcilable as appear the astronomical and geological facts, if we take for granted that the earth consists wholly of solid and liquid substances, they become at once reconcilable if we adopt the conclusion that the earth has a gaseous nucleus. If there is an internal cavity of considerable diameter occupied only by aeriform matter—if the density of the surrounding shell is, as it must in that case be, greater than the current supposition implies,"\* etc. Thus he would make the shell both thicker and heavier than is generally supposed. In this he is supported by the philosophers of India, who locate hell under the northern extremity of their continent, and have ascertained the depth to be five hundred yojanas, say five hundred thousand miles.

We were beginning to breathe more freely over this increasing firmness of our real estate, and the consequently firmer security of our institutions, when we met some coal-begrimed, hard-handed mechanics—a class of men who have as little faith in Murchison as in Moses, who do not care a cent for science any more than Scripture, and who ask no better fun than to hunt down a philosophical humbug. They speedily demonstrated, beyond contradiction, that if a boiler-full, either of superheated gas or of any liquid ready to flash into vapor on the removal of pressure, should be pierced with openings, like the craters of volcanoes, every ounce of gas, lava, or steam would be as infallibly driven out, as the water from the boiler

---

\* *Illustrations of Universal Progress*, 291.

of the Essex when it was riddled by the rebel guns, no matter what might be the thickness of the boiler. The objection is utterly unanswerable. The earth could not exist one hour under any such conditions as the geological theory demands.

But the defenders of the interior lake of fire retort the phenomena of earthquakes and volcanoes, as proof that the crust of the earth rests uneasily upon a fluid, as ice upon the water in a spring thaw, and allege that this is the only sufficient explanation of the phenomena of earthquakes, of volcanoes, and of the upheaval of mountains and continents in one place, and their subsidence in others. This, however, is only one of a dozen theories of the cause of earthquakes. Gay Lussac produces all the phenomena of earthquakes and volcanoes, by pouring sea-water through the clefts of the bottom of the sea into the interior of the earth, thus oxidizing the metalloids of the earths and alkalies, and producing an intense heat chemically. The eruptions and steam pressures thus excited, produce earthquakes in the overlying strata, and the upheaval of mountain chains, leaving vast cavities behind them to be filled with water and gases;\* and Lyell alleges this as a sufficient cause of the volcanic phenomena.† Boussingault manufactures both mountains and earthquakes by the cold process; he simply piles up his mountains loosely of sharp-edged fragments, like piles of gigantic brick-bats, which, settling and falling in from time to time, produce earthquakes. He omits to inform us, however, how this sinking process can raise mountain chains from ten to forty feet, along hundreds of miles, in a single night. Nor does he explain how such a process projected the bodies of the unfortunate inhabitants of Riobamba across the river Lican, and threw them to Cullea, over a hill several hundred feet above the former city.‡ Other scientific authorities show that mountains have been crushed up while soft, and appeal to the plication of their strata. But Ruskin has found vertical strata, in Savoy, made by cleavage. Humboldt proves that mountains have been elevated bit by bit, by

\* *Cosmos*, 5. 170.† *Principles of Geology*, ch xxxii.‡ *Cosmos*, 5. 172.



earthquakes; which Mallet denies and shows to be utterly impossible.\*

These three processes of mountain-making—by melting, by boiling, and by crumbling—are equally scientific, and equally certain. Chambers, however, says of them all: "The many proposed theories of mountain elevation are based upon assumptions which, unfortunately, are not true; but that is an unimportant matter to the majority of our speculative geologists, and one never seen by the inventors of the theories, who allow themselves to be led captive by a poetic imagination, instead of building their inductions on field observations. Thus to suppose that mountains are elevated by a wedge-like intrusion of melted matter is to give to a fluid functions incompatible with its dynamic properties. So, also, the supposition that the igneous rocks were intended as solid wedges separating and lifting the crust, is opposed to the fact that no apparent abrasion, but generally the closest adhesion, exists at the line of contact of igneous and stratified rocks. Equally fatal objections may be urged against the other theories."†

In this unfortunate muddle about our mountains among European geologists, an American writer, Prof. James Hall, steps in with an original process of mountain-making by water power. The oceans of ancient times deposited strata higher than the highest mountains, their currents scooped grooves and channels into the soft mud, now hardened into rocks, and the ridges left between these channels are the mountains. He accounts for the plications of mountainous strata by the unequal subsidence, and consequent unequal pressures, of the various materials. His theory seems perfectly adapted to the mountains of this continent.‡ If it be in any good measure reasonable, and many of our scientific men seem to think that it is, it totally removes the presumption in favor of an internal molten nucleus arising from the elevation of mountains and the plication of their strata. In any case, it is an illustra-

---

\* *Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1864. pp. 215, 222.    † *Chambers' Cyclopædia*. Art., *Appalachians*.    ‡ *American Cyclopædia*. Art., *Geology*.

tion of the utter contradiction of geological theories in regard to the fundamental facts of their systems.

These disagreements and contradictions concerning the very basis of geology are absolutely fatal to our faith in the infallibility of its theories and professors. If they can thus contradict each other about that very small part of the earth's surface which they have seen, how can we believe the accuracy of their accounts of that vast interior which no man ever saw? Accordingly, we observe that many eminent scientific men never believed in the igneous nucleus notion.

Of course, if there is a sea of melted granite of six thousand miles diameter inside the earth, it must obey the laws of fluids and be subject to tides. Poisson says these would rise and fall only fourteen inches; but Ampere, an equally scientific man, declares "the moon's action would produce tides analogous to those of our seas, but far more terrible, both from their extent and from the density of the liquid. It would be difficult to conceive how the envelope of the earth could be able to resist the incessant attacks of a sort of hydraulic ram fourteen hundred leagues in length." Moreover, the astronomers have demonstrated the impossibility of the fluid nucleus. La Place long ago showed that if the earth has been cooling it must have been contracting also, and so the day must have been shortening; but the day has not shortened by one three-hundredths of a second in two thousand years. Prof. Wm. Thompson, in a paper on *The Rigidity of the Earth*, presented to the Royal Society, May 15, 1862, from the established doctrine of the precession of the equinoxes, demonstrates that there can be no such molten and liquid interior of the earth as geologists dream of. He further showed that unless the solid portions of the earth be, on the whole, more rigid than steel, it must yield to the attractions of the sun and moon in such a way as very sensibly to diminish the oceanic tides. "But in order to this result the interior must be even more rigid than the superficial parts; and this is just what might be expected if—the interior being solid—the enormous pressure upon it be taken into account."<sup>\*</sup> A similar conclu-

---

<sup>\*</sup> *American Cyclopædia*, 1862. p. 392.

sion results from a consideration of the earth's excentricity. A globe chiefly molten could not retain its present shape half a year on any known principles of hydrostatics.

The all-important question then arises, if there is no molten nucleus, what is the dense and rigid material, more dense than cast-iron and more rigid than steel, which constitutes the nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of our globe, compared with which our geological strata are but as the thickness of the skin to the onion, and whose chemical, electrical, magnetic and mechanical movements are hourly affecting our surface geology? Without an answer to this question any theory of world-building is merely a burlesque—indeed, the professor of the whitewash-brush is much better qualified to set up for architect for the capitol than the geologist acquainted only with surface strata to frame a theory of world-building. The Hindoo earth rests on the elephant's back; the elephant stands on the tortoise's back; what does the tortoise stand on? The tertiary rocks rest on the secondary; the secondary on the primary; what do the primary rest on? To this geologists respond in learned phrase as follows: "Laying aside all hypothesis, our knowledge of the constitution of the earth's crust may be summarily stated. 1. The density of the rocky crust is on an average two and a half times that of water. 2. The mean density of the whole mass is five times that of water. 3. The central part can not be composed of similar materials with the crust, otherwise the compression toward the centre would become so great that the mean density of the earth would be greater than it is. 4. That the condensation of the central mass must be counterbalanced by some expansive influence such as heat, or have a *constitution unlike any substance with which we are acquainted.*"\* Which being translated into the vulgar tongue means that they do not know, and can not even guess, what it is. And yet these are the "geological grounds" in which the Colenso class "know for certain" the errors of the Bible cosmogony. Leaving scientific blunders to the Rationalist clergy, and

---

\* Chambers' *Geology*, p. 13.

emancipated by these confessions of ignorance, and proofs of error, from the scientific pretensions of the world-makers, the advanced geologists set themselves to discover, by their own observations, the condition of the earth's nucleus. In this process they stumbled upon a discovery which has revolutionized the whole structure of speculative geology—the discovery that granite is not an igneous rock at all, but is of aqueous origin—a mortar baked and hardened by heat, like any other metamorphic rock; and then the necessary consequence of this, that instead of the granite furnishing the materials of the stratified rocks, these furnished the materials of the granite. In a word, the process of world-building is the very reverse of that imagined by our anti-Bible geologists. The controversy is like that between two sets of inductive philosophers, investigating one of the old brick-kilns of Egypt; one set finding a layer of brick earth, and some bricks weather-worn with the action of centuries, set themselves to calculate how many millenniums the bricks had been in crumbling down into clay; the others alleging that they were in possession of facts proving that the clay was not made by crumbling down the bricks, but that the bricks were baked out of the clay. The mode of this discovery was purely scientific and experimental, and its results are so far-reaching and instructive that we shall follow it step by step. It is the result of an accumulation of facts, by different observers, for a series of years, all bearing in one direction, and capable of only one interpretation, which interpretation has been given by the acknowledged leaders of geology, and can no longer be refused by those whose science is only the second-hand utterance of their discoveries; namely, that granite is an aqueous formation.

The process of this discovery was on this wise. The younger geologists, believing that the substances ejected by volcanoes were derived from the lowest depths to which man would ever have access, began to collect and analyse volcanic products: gases, waters and minerals. To their surprise they found that these consisted simply of the constituents of sedimentary rocks, frequently of large quantities of these rocks themselves, in a half-melted state, and in several cases, of immense quan-

tities of the shells of infusoria and even of fish and pine twigs.\* It was quite evident there was no igneous fusion of granite down there, else the shells would have been burned, and in some cases not even heat enough to broil fish or to burn pine twigs. Granite was found overlying the tertiary strata in Jamaica, and even penetrating it, which proved the granite to be a younger rock than the tertiary.† Next followed the discovery that all the constituents of granite existed in the sedimentary rocks, and could be actually manufactured out of them.‡ Then, in the progress of exploration, water-marks were discovered in micaschist, heretofore regarded as an igneous rock, and of fossils in other so-called plutonic rocks.§ Then the discovery of graphite in granite was declared by eminent chemists inconsistent with melting heat. "The presence of graphite (black lead) in granite, gneiss and diorite, says an eminent chemist, has renewed the dispute between the neptunists and the plutonists. Graphite is known to be nearly pure carbon, for it leaves in burning but a very small quantity of ash. Now, if these primitive crystalline rocks are of igneous formation, it is impossible to explain how graphite could co-exist with silicates of protoxyd of iron, without having reduced these salts; judging merely by what takes place in blast furnaces, since carbon reduces all oxyds of iron at a high temperature. It must then be admitted that granite, gneiss and diorites did not contain graphite when the mineral elements of these rocks, such as mica, hornblende and other silicates were in a state of fusion. Graphite, then, must have been subsequently introduced into these rocks; but when and how? Questions like these are difficult to answer. The most plausible hypothesis is by the wet way into the crystalline rocks, and substituted for one of the mineral components. Thus in the gneiss of Poisson it takes the place of mica."||

Then came the discovery of magnetic iron ore in plutonic rocks, and even of fossils. "At the recent meeting of the London Geologist Association, Mr. Tomlinson, after advert-

\* *Cosmos*. 5. 277. † *Annual of Scientific Discovery*. 1863. p. 272. ‡ *Ibid*. 1861, p. 79, and 1865, p. 312. § *Ibid*. 1864. p. 241.

|| *London Chemical News*, cited in *Annual Scien. Dis.* 1865. p. 219.

ing to the close resemblance or identity of the slags and dross of iron furnaces with naturally formed volcanic rocks—as lava, pitch, stones, etc.—stated, that while we may regard the plutonic origin of such rocks as certain, it should be borne in mind that volcanic rocks formed but a small proportion only of the rocks termed plutonic, or fire-formed. All granites, and certain porphyries, were generally regarded as fused by such action at great depths. But as many of these rocks contained magnetic iron ore they could not be the results of fusion, else their composition would be that of a vitreous instead of crystalline rock. In cooling, quartz and iron would not separate, the oxides having a strong affinity for silica. Another difficulty which presented itself to the mind of the plutonist was, that fossil forms were occasionally met with in magnetic iron ore; as the Devonian Crachiopod *Spirifer Speciosus*, which was thus formed in a quartz rock mixed with iron pyrites. Such facts pointed more to a neptunistic than to a plutonic origin for granite, quartz, and other allied rocks.”

The same conclusion results from a comparison of the specific gravity of quartz with feldspar. The quartz being the heaviest must have sunk to the bottom of the molten mass, as water sinks through oil; and we should find it, not scattered in crystals through the granite, but all in one mass at the bottom. Accordingly we find Von Fuchs deciding absolutely against the igneous theory. “He reasoned against the view that the crystalline rocks were once in a state of fusion as follows, using granite as an illustration: If granite were once in a molten condition, then, as it cooled, in the first place, quartz must have crystallized out, and would have sunk down through the still molten mass, while feldspar and mica must have crystallized at a much later stage of cooling, as the necessary consequence of their different degrees of fusibility. Further, the inclusion of arsenical pyrites, sulphide of antimony, tourmaline, garnet, fluor spar, etc., by quartz is incompatible with the crystallization of the latter from a state of igneous fusion. He proceeds to show that amorphous must precede crystalline rocks, and that originally the solid part of the earth consisted of silica and silicates in the amorphous



form, while the liquid portions were largely made up of solutions of lime and magnesia, and their carbonates."\* This is merely a translation of the second verse of Genesis into scientific language.

Thus far the steady progress of discovery was an accumulation of facts disproving the igneous formation of the crystalline rocks, under known chemical and mechanical conditions, against an unproved assumption that granite was an igneous formation. Not a single fact supporting the assumption had ever been presented, save our ignorance of the interior of the earth, and the assumption that every thing must be melted by extreme heat down there. Attempts were made, however, to imitate the subterranean conditions of heat under pressure. Experiments were made to ascertain the effect of pressure on melting bodies ; and it was found by Hopkins that immense pressure prevented their melting, unless at greatly increased heats. Next, experiments were made by Daubree, and others, to melt quartz, and the other constituents of granite, by igneous fusion ; which settled forever the question as to the heat of the melting point in the simplest manner ; namely, that it would not melt at all, but that its crystals would decompose, and the mass become lighter in the fire, as all clayey substances do ; or, where there was sufficient alkali, would form a black glass, of quite a different structure and specific gravity from granite.† The product of the igneous fusion of the materials of granite is not granite at all, no more than the ash and cinder of coal is coal, or than a glass tumbler is silex. It is a different substance.

Dr. Percy, of the London School of Mines, in a recent lecture, objected to the assertion of geologists that granitic rocks must have been formed by plutonic agencies ; for, said he, "There are certain difficulties which have always stood in the way of accepting this view of the subject—difficulties known to those who have been accustomed to make experiments on the fusion of mineral substances at high temperatures. This is especially seen by examining the condition of quartz in granite ; it is always found in the crystalline condition, and

\* *Annual of Scientific Discovery*, 1858, p. 301. † *Ibid.* 1861, p. 279.—1865, p. 312.

has invariably a specific gravity of 2.6. There is not a single instance known to the contrary. Hence there is reason to believe that the quartz could never have been fused; for the moment silica is fused, no matter in what condition it was previously, a peculiar glass-like, colloidal mass is produced, having a specific gravity which never exceeds 2.3. *Therefore there is good reason to conclude that granite could never have been formed under the conditions of a high temperature.*"

It only remained now to show how granite was formed, in the wet way, from the sedimentary rocks; and this demonstration has been given, and the granite actually manufactured accordingly. T. Sterry Hunt, F. R. S., of the Canada Geological Commission, in a paper on *The Theory of the Transformation of the Sedimentary Deposits into Crystalline Rocks*, thus explains the matter: "We can not admit that the alteration of the sedimentary rocks has been effected by a great elevation of temperature, approaching, as many have imagined, to igneous fusion; for we find unoxidized carbon in the form of graphite both in beds of crystalline limestone and in beds of iron ore; and it is well known that these substances, and even the vapor of water, oxidize graphite at a red heat, with formation of carbonic acid and carbonic oxide. I have, however, shown that solutions of alkaline carbonates, in presence of silica and earthy carbonates, slowly give rise to silicates with disengagement of carbonic acid, even at a temperature of  $212^{\circ}$ ; the alkali being converted into a silicate, which is then decomposed by the earthy carbonate regenerating the alkaline salt, which serves as an intermedium between the silica and the earthy base. I have thus endeavored to explain the production of the various silicates of lime, magnesia and oxide of iron, so abundant in crystalline rocks; and with the intervention of the argillaceous element, the formation of chlorite, epidote and garnet. I called attention to the constant presence of small portions of alkalies in insoluble combination in these silicates—a fact which had already led Kuhlmann to conclude that alkaline silicates have played an important part in the formation of many minerals; and I suggested that, by combining with alkalies, clays might yield feld-

spars and micas (the chief ingredients of granite), which are commonly associated in nature with the silicates above mentioned. This suggestion has been verified by Daubree, who has succeeded in producing feldspars by heating together for some weeks, to 400° C., mixtures of kaolin and alkaline silicates in the presence of water. The problem of the generation from the sands, clays and earthy carbonates of the sedimentary deposits, of the various silicious minerals which make up the crystalline rocks, may now be regarded as solved; and we find the agent of the process in waters holding in solution carbonates and silicates acting upon the heated strata.\* In a word, granite is a mortar, not a metal. To this conclusion the most advanced geologists of Europe have been slowly, but irresistibly, impelled; and within the last seven years such men as M. Rose, Poulett Scrope, Scheerer, Sorby, Elie de Beaumont, Lyell and Ansted have given their testimony against the fallacy of the igneous theory. Myspace permits only one or two testimonies out of a number before me.

Sir Charles Lyell, in his speech on taking the Chair of the British Association as president for 1864, asserts, *ex cathedra*: "Various experiments have led to the conclusion that the minerals which enter most largely into the composition of the metamorphic rocks have not been formed by crystallizing from a state of fusion, or in the dry way, but that they have been derived from liquid solutions, or in the wet way—a process requiring a far less intense degree of heat. . . . The study, of late years, of the constituent parts of granite, has, in like measure, led to the conclusion that their consolidation has taken place at temperatures far below those formerly supposed to be indispensable. Gustav Rose has pointed out that the quartz of granite has the specific gravity of 2.6, which characterizes silica when it is precipitated from a liquid solvent, and not that inferior density, namely, 2.3, which belongs to it when it cools and solidifies in the dry way from a state of fusion."

The latest scientific deliverance on the subject is by Prof. Ansted, in a paper read before the British Association of

---

\* *Journal of the Geological Society*. London. 1859.

1867, on *The Conversion of Stratified Rock into Granite*. "Geologists until recently have spoken of granite as a primitive rock, as the nucleus of the earth, and as having been from time to time erupted, playing an important part in the general disturbances by which the frame-work of the earth is supposed to have been constructed. The observations of Daubree and Sorby show that all true granite had been elaborated with water, under great pressure, at a temperature below melting heat; that it had neither been ejected nor had it formed a frame-work. There are granites of all ages and of many kinds. Numerous observations show that granite alternates with, and passes into, stratified rocks, and must itself in such cases be stratified rock; and that its production does not necessarily involve the destruction and obliteration of all the stratified rocks with which it is associated. This view of the nature of granite will greatly affect the theories of geology."<sup>\*</sup>

That this discovery will not only greatly affect, but completely revolutionize, the current theory of geology can not be doubted. There is no denying the facts of the case, for the feldspar has been actually manufactured, and for two years the evidence has been before the public. How long our geologists may be in learning this discovery we can not tell. They are accustomed to demand long periods in other parts of their system, though they are quite prompt to notice any discovery which may be alleged as bearing against the Bible; witness the Abbeville jaw-bone hoax. The American lecturers, have, however, maintained a most industrious silence regarding this great discovery for reasons best known to themselves. Are they terrified at the prospect of losing the scientific basis for skepticism? Or are they mortified at the exposure of the greatness of their blunder? For, as there is no longer a possibility of any scientific denial of the aqueous formation of granite, there is no evading the consequence of its acknowledgment—that the whole current system of geological cosmogony, based upon the molten granite notion, is based on error and

---

<sup>\*</sup> *Annual of Scientific Discovery*. 1868. p. 226.

impossibility, and so is utterly erroneous and impossible. Must they confess their ignorance and self-conceit in abusing the author of the Hebrew myths, because he did not describe the Creator as forming a globe of molten granite, a substance which never had an existence? It is very natural, and, moreover, quite characteristic of the school, to keep silent on the subject; but I hope that every reader of this article will make himself so familiar with the facts of the case that he will be able to silence any infidel lecturer who begins to play off his molten granite against the Bible.

This is another instance of the process now becoming familiar, by which the blunders of hasty generalizations from an imperfect series of observed facts are corrected by a more complete and accurate observation: and the theory deduced from the imperfect series of facts, is found to be not only incomplete, but utterly erroneous. Inspired by the native enmity of materialism to every thing spiritual, infidels have always been ready to seize upon any discovery which appeared different from the accepted Bible accounts of nature; and without waiting to see whether they had read the Bible correctly, indeed, in some cases without reading it at all, they hastened to supplement the facts by a theory of their own invention, as contrary as possible to what they supposed the Bible account, and then christening this mongrel, begotten of fact and fiction, science, they have set up the little whelps to bark lustily against the veracity of Moses and the prophets. Thus, upon the re-discovery of the Copernican astronomy, in the sixteenth century, the infidel philosophers of France made a grand assault upon the Bible as sustaining the old Ptolemaic system, because it spoke in popular language of the rising and setting of the sun; and they were especially severe upon Joshua for commanding the sun to stand still when he wanted to lengthen the day, when he ought, as they alleged, to have ordered the earth to stop its rotation. It never entered into their self-conceited heads to imagine for one moment that they were not perfectly acquainted with all the facts and principles of celestial machinery, and that the discovery of some unknown and superior principle might harmonize the

word and the works of God. They were accordingly struck dumb with amazement when the discovery of the grand motion of the solar system showed that Joshua was right in commanding the sun to stop when he desired to stop the onward motion, and consequent rotation, of the earth and sun; just as a conductor who desires to stop the rotation of a car-wheel will direct the engineer to stop the locomotive.

So far as geology deserves the name of science—so far as it furnishes and classifies facts—it will furnish testimonies of a Power superior to nature, and of the existence of orderly arrangement, evident adaptation of beings to their place, and of the permanence of One Design running through all its provinces. To this permanence of design the naturalist gives the name of “law;” and from the existence of law, reason infers the existence of a Lawgiver, to devise the plan, to bestow the force, to guide the regularity of observed processes. An atheistic geology therefore is, from the nature of the case, impossible; the very classification of the facts proving the existence of a creating scientific classifying mind prior to the existence of the observing scientific classifying mind. Agassiz justly observes that true classification is the discovery and expression of the Creator’s plan. But, inasmuch as science deals only with the things created, it can know nothing of beginnings. Like other infants, it can not describe its own birth, and so can not produce a cosmogony. A scientific cosmogony is a contradiction in terms.

For this, among other reasons, the proposed reconciliations of Genesis and geology were all, and always, unnecessary. There could be no conflict between them. They belong to different spheres. The geologist can not describe the process of creation, and Moses does not. It may well be asked, indeed is there any process from nothing to something? Creation must be instantaneous. Moses, accordingly, merely tells us, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;” then that an indefinite period of sedimentary formations succeeded; and that a few thousand years ago God prepared a part of the earth’s surface for the occupation of the existing human race. It is no part of the design of the Bible to teach



geology, or any other science which man can learn from God's works; yet no man has ever succeeded in proving that any statement of this ancient volume contradicts *any fact* of modern science. When we consider the ideas of the most learned men of surrounding nations of that period concerning the origin of the world, and peruse the fables they have written, we perceive a wondrous contrast with the Bible narrative. Compare, for example, the Chinese story of Pwangku chiseling out the granite heavens, or the Hindoo cosmogony of the sacred egg, and of the emergence of the sacred mount, and the seven seas of milk, melted butter, honey, rum, etc., from an inundation which drowned all the heavens up to the pole-star, with the sobriety and dignity of the Bible, and ask, whence this astonishing contrast? Contrast the reticence of Moses with the garrulity of our modern savans when they enter upon cosmogony. World-making is one of the strongest passions of the human intellect. How comes it to pass that Moses resists the temptation by which our most sober inductive philosophers have been seduced, to describe the processes of creation, the condensing nebulae, the igneous nucleus, etc.? The writer who could describe light as "the undulation," "the flowing," who knew that it existed before the sun, who could describe man's intellectual supremacy, and yet assert his recent arrival on earth, who could describe the sky as the expansion, "and hang the earth upon nothing," could surely have speculated upon the Development Theory. Why, then, did not Moses make a fool of himself, like the Chinese, Hindoos and geologists, by giving us an impossible cosmogony? There is only one power which can restrain the insane pride of the human intellect from intoxicating itself with the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, and becoming as gods, and driveling forth its drunken projects of creation. That power restrained Moses from astronomical and geological cosmogonies. And when we remember the theological cosmogonies, Hebrew, Patristic, Monkish, Protestant and Pantheistic, which have been spun professedly out of the allusions of the Bible, so much more absurd than those of the heathen, and so much more mischievous as claiming divine authority, we see

that nothing less than divine restraint prevented Moses from giving the world a circumstantial geological cosmogony to be the laughing stock of future discoverers.

True Science, in view of such developments, will maintain a respectful attitude to Scripture. It will fearlessly prosecute its researches into the works of God, and calmly and clearly tell its discoveries; and it will not intrude into the domains of Revelation, with whose objects, methods and phenomena it professes to have no acquaintance. It will be especially shy of meddling with subjects beyond its own domain of the visible and tangible, and will feel insulted when men parade their day-dreams of world-building as her discoveries. And, considering how the credulity of Christendom has been of late years abused by all sorts of pretended scientific discoveries, the true philosopher will acknowledge the reasonableness of a little popular incredulity regarding scientific novelties, and more especially if they come heralded as fatal to faith in the Bible; for we have had now eighteen centuries experience of the truth of Jesus Christ, and it is too much to expect equal confidence in any mushroom philosophical theory.

The interpreter of God's word will feel equally friendly toward the interpreter of God's works. He well knows there can be no antagonism between them; and when the cry of the discovery of some great ante-Biblical fact is raised, he will not feel at all disturbed. He has heard this alarm often before, but the Bible stands yet. God's anvil has worn out many a hammer. He will not deny any authentic fact of science because it does not tally with his preconceived notions of Scripture. As the prophetic Scriptures are best interpreted by the fulfillment, so the scientific scriptures are best interpreted by the discovery. For though creation and revelation are both infallible prophets, yet our interpretations both of science and Scripture are quite likely to prove fallible and erroneous. The remembrance of the blunders of theologians in attempting to construct science out of Scripture, and of the blunders of geologists in extracting a cosmogony out of science, ought to teach both the humility proper to ignorance.

As to anti-Christian theories of geology, past, present, or

future, we presume most of our readers are quite satisfied to dismiss them to the care of those who have nothing better to occupy their attention. Its history (as we have seen), up to the beginning of this century, is a succession of wild imaginations and baseless fictions, each eagerly believed for a time, and speedily dismissed for a more attractive successor. We have examined the maps and documents presenting its alleged facts, and have found them to be, for the most part, purely imaginary delineations of strata never examined, nor possible to be examined by man ; while the grossest misrepresentations of countries, and even of whole continents, including our own, furnish the foundation of the fashionable geological theories. We have seen the contradictions of the geological authorities on the most important practical questions, and the impossibility for non-professional men to decide between them ; and we could easily fill a volume with such conflicting authorities. And we have also presented the very latest discoveries, not of second-hand geologists, but those of the foremost actual investigators of nature, and their experiments upon the constitution and mode of formation of the lowest rocks accessible to man, experiments which utterly demolish the current geological cosmogony, leaving the whole system in utter chaos. There is no foundation left ; no knowledge of materials out of which to rebuild the globe ; no known processes of construction ; no elements of chronology ; no sufficient force in nature for peopling or forming the world. The materials accessible for the construction of a new theory consist in an imperfect knowledge of about one ten-thousandth part of the earth's crust, and a profound ignorance of the nature and energy of the materials and forces by which the vast mass beneath continually operates upon this little portion of the surface. Yet upon this slender basis, we may rest assured, new anti-Biblical theories will speedily be erected : for man was created in the image of the Creator, and must make worlds, and will have the honor of the invention. Doubtless, each of these geologies in its turn will be demolished by its successor ; but that will not deter mankind from making and loving and believing another lie. In the three-score years and ten of a busy life, men who

have bread to earn, and families to keep, and souls to save, can not give personal attention to geology, nor solve for themselves the great problems of the universe ; if they believe anything on such subjects they must take somebody's word for it, and it is a matter of choice whether a man shall believe Lyell or Moses, Christ or Colenso. The choice will be determined by the man's disposition ; if he dislikes Bible religion he will not believe its prophets ; he will receive in preference the allegations of men who, without pretending to revelation from any one who has seen it, describe the interior of the earth. But one would suppose even the credulity of infidelity would be nauseated with endless impositions ; and that common sense would suggest—as all these geological refutations of the Bible are false, what if its account of God and the world be true ?

This Bible is one of the powers in the moral world. It has existed over thirty centuries, and has revolutionized our own and many other nations, rendering the pursuit of geology, and of science, possible among the descendants of savages. It reveals to us the great fact of the subserviency of physical to moral law ; declaring that the last diluvial epoch which swept the habitable earth was coincident with the grossest moral corruption of mankind. It predicts another vast geological revolution, “in which the life of earth shall make another grand advance, greater even than that at the dawn of the human period, a revolution in which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up.” It declares that the Judge shall descend at that day, and reward every man according to his works. There will remain no place for criticizing spectators. All who are not supernaturally preserved shall meet the just punishment of their sins. Reader, are you prepared with a Refuge for that day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men ? Oh ! make the Creator of the globe your friend ! He makes you this proposal, that you shall confess and forsake your sins, and own Him as your Saviour and Lord, and he will cover you with his strength when the mountains are cast into the sea.

"The mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." "We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." "The tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away."

---

ART. II.—THE REFORMED OR CALVINISTIC SENSE.

By E. D. MORRIS, D. D., Professor in Lane Seminary, Ohio.

It was a noble desire of Henderson, one of the Scottish representatives in the Westminster Assembly, that the transactions of that venerable body should not only become effectual in uniting the evangelical churches of the three kingdoms, but should also prove the basis of a grand Protestant Union, embracing the various branches of the Reformed Church throughout Northern and Central Europe. This desire was informally communicated by Henderson and some of his associates to the churches of Holland, and to the celebrated Openstiern, then Chancellor of Sweden; and for a time their suggestion became the subject of earnest negotiations among leading minds in the Reformed circles. Had such negotiations eventuated in action—had such a general Union been formed on the basis of a sound, just, fraternal Calvinism, the subsequent career of the various European churches bearing the Calvinistic name, and the subsequent history of Protestantism itself, would have been essentially modified. The cunning arguments of Bossuet in view of the *variations* in that Protestantism—by which even the youthful Gibbon was at one time led to sympathize with the Papal faith—would then have been fatally weakened. The visible unity of these churches

on such a foundation would not only have rendered such criticism ineffective, but also have furnished the surest protection against all other forms of Papal assault. It would have afforded to a free and spiritual Christianity a much more firm and advantageous position in the several countries, and among the various nationalities, represented in such Union. It would have obliterated by degrees those diversities of doctrine and of sentiment, which had originated in local causes merely; it would have enabled the several parties and sections to know and understand, to respect and love, one another. It would have tended to draw the Reformed and the Lutheran churches into closer fellowship, and to return the divided stream of the Reformation into one broad, deep, fertilizing current. It might have been an introductory and decisive step toward that comprehensive communion of saints, and that unifying of the Body of Christ, for which devout souls in our day are longing, and which all believers recognize as a condition precedent to the dawning of the millennial age.

The failure of these negotiations may be traced in part to external causes: diversities of race and language, varieties of temperament, culture, usage, and especially political policies and interests, stood in the way of such union, and frustrated every ardent endeavor to secure it. It is traceable partly to internal causes, existing in the constitution or incorporated in the belief of the various Reformed churches; found in the ambition of leading minds, or in the intestine strifes of party, or the complications of state control. If the external conditions had been favorable to Union, the sentiment of brotherhood had not attained such maturity, neither had the principles or the advantages of such Union been so far appreciated as to render the actual combination of all the Calvinistic churches, on the basis of any single creed, either practicable or desirable. If such appreciations had existed, and this sentiment of brotherhood had been far more widely diffused and more controlling, it still is questionable whether these external hindrances would not have presented an insuperable barrier to the Union sought. These causes, external and internal, not only prevented the churches of Holland and London, Switzerland and France,



from joining in such an alliance; they even precluded such an alliance among the several evangelical parties within the British Isles. The Reformed churches, therefore, remained in the state of separation, disintegrate and variant; and Bossuet found the specious occasion he desired, to show the schismatic character of Protestantism, and to prove that in Rome alone true unity, real concord, were to be found.

Among these obstructing causes, it should be specially observed that diversities in doctrine occupied only a subordinate place. The Westminster Confession had gathered into itself, and had considerably set forth, all that was essential in the various Reformed symbols which had preceded it; it had incorporated even more fully than the Heidelberg Catechism or the Helvetic Confessions, the substance of that strong, vital, indestructible Calvinism, which was the common life and glory of the Reformed churches. It had been framed amid circumstances which preserved it from the incompleteness, the narrowness, the partizanship, characteristic of some among the antecedent Confessions. It could therefore claim to be, in no ordinary sense, a representative expression of the doctrines embraced and held within the Calvinistic household; and to furnish a solid and spacious platform on which the various branches of that household might stand and rejoice together, as such an expression and such a platform. Henderson and his associates presented it to their brethren of like faith throughout Northern Europe; and if other causes had permitted on any basis the fraternal union thus desired, we may be assured that the Reformers would generally have recognized this Confession as both the latest and the best exposition of their common faith.

I. This view of the Westminster Confession may be illustrated by an enumeration and survey of the various Calvinistic symbols which had preceded it, during the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries. Passing backward from the years 1646-48, when the Confession was finished by the Assembly, and submitted to the inspection of Parliament, we find the first of these symbols in the *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, first authoritatively promulgated in 1619, as containing the

accepted doctrine of the Reformed Church throughout the Netherlands. This Synod, although composed mainly of representatives from that Church, might almost be regarded as ecumenical, inasmuch as it contained delegates from Sweden, from different parts of Germany, from France and Switzerland, and even from England and Scotland. Convened primarily by the authority of Maurice of Orange, for the purpose of arresting the growing influence of Arminianism, then entrenched in the University of Leyden, it still aimed to be a body representing the entire circle of Calvinistic opinion; and its canons, though directed mainly against the Remonstrant party, and unhappily affected with the controversy with them, may still be accepted as an important representation of the Calvinistic faith.

The year 1571 is memorable as the date of three national creeds, prepared independently of each other, and characterized by provincial peculiarities, yet combining remarkably to illustrate the degree of unity in doctrine prevalent among the Reformed churches. The first of these is the *Belgic Confession*, originally drafted ten years earlier, as a private declaration of belief, but at this date revised and adopted by the churches of Holland; a symbol closely connected therefore with the canons of the Synod of Dort, and by that Synod subsequently ratified as a valuable exposition of sacred truth. The second is the *Galic Confession*, first composed in 1559, by a Synod representing the Calvinistic churches of France, and convened at Paris, but finally approved, and made the formal basis of French Protestantism, twelve years later, at Rochelle. The third of these provincial symbols is the *Thirty-Nine Articles* of the Church of England; drafted at first by Cranmer and Ridley, and adopted by act of Synod in 1552, then revised by the bishops of the English Church, and accepted by Synod in 1562, and finally sanctioned by Parliament in the year already given; a symbol in substantial harmony with the other Calvinistic Confessions of that era as to doctrine, but proclaiming the prelatical polity, and verging toward Lutheranism in its conception of the sacraments.

With this triad of Reformed symbols, there should be asso-

ciated a second triad, promulgated a few years earlier, and, like these, independent and provincial, yet historically and in their essential features closely allied both to these and to one another ; namely, the *Scotch Confession*, the second or main *Helvetic Confession*, and the *Hiedelberg Catechism*. Of these the first was but the transplantation into Scottish soil of that system of divine truth, which the vivid brain and earnest heart of John Knox had learned in the society of Calvin at Geneva, and which he had so preached after his return, as to set all Scotland in a glow of fervid approbation. The second may be regarded as the maturest product of the Genevan school of theology, in the decade immediately succeeding the decease of Calvin; a symbol afterwards condensed into several local Confessions, and in its full form widely accepted, not merely in Switzerland, but also in Hungary, Poland and France. The third had its origin in the struggles of Calvinistic princes to establish the Reformed faith, instead of Lutheranism, throughout the Palatinate ; and is characterized by a remarkable degree of moderation in statement, and of conciliation in tone. "In doctrine," says another, "it teaches justification with the Lutheran glow and vitality, predestination and election with Calvinistic firmness and self-consistency, and the Zwinglian theory of the sacraments with decision."

Following the ascending line of Calvinistic symbolism to a point still closer to the era of the Reformation, and passing by the two minor Confessions proposed by Calvin himself in exposition of certain particular doctrines, we are brought to a third triad of creeds or symbols, historically connected with those already named, and of special interest as indicating the first formal divergence, in respect of doctrine, between the Reformed and the Lutheran churches : the *First Helvetic* or *Second Basle Confession*, subscribed by the seven Protestant cantons of Switzerland in 1536, the *First Basle Confession*, adopted by the cities of Basle and Muhlhausen in 1532, and the *Fidei Ratio* written by Zwingle in 1530. This primary group of Reformed symbols, all of Swiss origin, are the products of that formative period, when both the Helvetic and the German reformers were still struggling together against the might of the

Papacy, and while their differences were confined mainly to the single question of the sacraments. They are of special value, on one side, as indicating the degree of harmony in belief, as well as in feeling, between the Reformed and the Lutheran churches; the one first named having been submitted to the Lutheran party at Wurtemberg and at Smalcald, as an adequate basis of unity or of concord for the entire Protestant movement. They possess even greater value on the other side, as showing what the Reformed church was in its earliest stages, and what were the germs from which its more mature expressions of faith have sprung.

II. A proper appreciation of this remarkable series of symbols, as containing a consistent and valid system of doctrine, requires some recognition of their *relations to antecedent and to contemporaneous symbolism*. In a Confession drafted by Calvin in 1562, in the name of the Protestant churches of France, but which was never formally adopted by any of the Reformed organizations, he declares that "on all the articles which have been decided by ancient Councils, touching the infinite spiritual essence of God, and the distinction of the three Persons, and the union of two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ, we receive and agree in all that was therein resolved, as being drawn from the Holy Scriptures." In like manner the Reformers generally, whether Calvinistic or Lutheran, were content to appeal to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, as well as to that bearing the name of the Apostles, as decisive authority on all trinitarian and christological questions. They accept, also, in general, the Augustinian in distinction from the Pelagian anthropology, including both the primitive creation in righteousness and the subsequent fall, and also the consequent depravity and helplessness and guilt of mankind. On all of these important points, the Protestant symbols were articulated vitally upon what had been the common faith of the church from the days of Augustine and Athanasius. They not only excluded the false soteriology, and the still more false morality, which had crept into the Church under the Papal régime; they also went back of the Papacy to the period of more pure and more primitive conviction, and joined

themselves historically to those primary beliefs, which an awakened Christian consciousness had first been engaged in framing, and on which the Church for twelve centuries, even amid Romish corruptions, had been reposing.\*

This recognized connection with the early Christian faith—this cordial acceptance of the precious heritage which had thus descended from the primitive centuries of Christianity, will account, on the one hand, for the comparative absence in the Protestant symbols of elaborate statements in respect to those theological and christological questions which had so greatly absorbed the interest of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries. The Reformers were content to receive, with little more than a correct translation into the current speech, the doctrines which had been settled at Nice and Ephesus and Chalcedon; and when those doctrines were subsequently assailed by the ancient heresies arrayed in more modern dress, they were still content with the repetition, in language suited to the times, of the decisive answer which the primitive church had given. On the other hand, this fact will account in large degree for the manner in which their various Confessions were constructed; and especially for the form in which the central doctrine of those Confessions—the doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus—was presented. That grand truth was a direct and irresistible deduction from these primary beliefs; it was the sublime consequence of what the early church had thought and declared concerning the Saviour, and the need of redemption through Him; and in thus presenting it, in wide contrast with the unhistoric and illogical dogma of Rome, as the *articula vel stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, the Reformers, both Lutheran and Calvinistic, were simply

\* The testimony of the Catholic Moehler is significant on this point: "The Apostolic, Nicene and Athanasian creeds, and in general all the doctrinal decrees which the first four general Councils have laid down, in respect to the Trinity and to the Person of Christ, those Protestants who are faithful to their church recognize in common with Catholics. On this point the Lutherans, at the commencement of the Augsburg Confession, as well as in the Smalcald Articles, solemnly declared their belief. No less explicit and public were the declarations of the Reformed. These formularies constitute the common property of the separate churches—the precious dowry which the otherwise daughters carried away with them from the maternal house to their new settlements." *Symbolism*. p. 11.

proving themselves to be the true descendants of the primitive Fathers, and the true heirs and possessors of the primitive faith.

In respect to this doctrine, as well as to the ancient beliefs on which it reposed, the Lutheran and Calvinistic Symbols were in substantial harmony. On other points they differed, especially on the nature and office of the sacraments, and on the elective decrees and elective grace of God in their bearings on human redemption. The unhappy controversy concerning the Eucharist, led by degrees to diversities of sentiment on related topics, and to a gradual separation, in doctrine as well as in organization, between these two sections of the Protestant host. Between the Gallic or Belgic Confessions, and the *Formula Concordiæ*, issued a few years later, as a formal exposition of matured Lutheranism, we discover a much wider difference, not in the sacramentarian question merely, than is apparent in any comparison of the Augsburg Confession with any Reformed formulary of that earlier era. Notwithstanding the distance and the alienation, which varieties of nationality and taste and training, and other kindred causes, were continually tending to develop among the Reformers, their hearts at first were constantly aspiring after unity, in faith as well as in feeling. Luther and Calvin were closely and cordially agreed upon the really fundamental points in theology; and wherein they differed, they still were conscious of standing within the broad circumference of the same system of sacred truth. Calvin declared, in respect to the Augsburg Confession, that it was his pride willingly and cheerfully to subscribe it; and to the close of his life he shared with Melancthon in the ardent desire to exalt the points of agreement, to the relative suppression of the points of difference, between the two great branches of the Protestant household.\*

The Reformed symbolism was thus vitally connected both

---

\* It has well been said, that "Melancthon was a man of peace in the midst of war, and a man of union in the midst of discords." Better than any other among the leading Reformers, he represents the tendency toward union within the circle of Protestantism. In the later years of his life, he was constantly acting as a mediator, in respect to theological opinion, between the Lutheran and Calvinistic parties. His prevalent feeling was once revealed in the words: "If my eyes were a fountain of tears, rich as the waters of the river Elbe, I



with the established belief of primitive times, and with the best convictions, on all essential points, of those who gave form to the Lutheran faith. It started from a genuine and vigorous stock; it grew in good soil, and under healthful conditions. It inherited the purest life, the noblest inspiration, the most substantial treasures of the past; it received into itself the best thoughts, and shared the holiest sympathies, of those to whom God had given the great task of emancipating the Church from Papal thralldom, and whom he had endowed with mental and spiritual capacities adequate to their high vocation. It is well to bear these connections in mind, for it has justly been said that "comparative symbolism is to theology what comparative anatomy is to physical science, or what comparative philology is to the science of language."

III. Reverting now to the Reformed, in distinction from the Patristic or Lutheran Symbols, and considering these in the chronological succession already indicated, we discover at once *an organic growth* in respect to the system of doctrine therein contained. From the Fidei Ratio to the Westminster Confession there is a steady advance, a healthful progress toward maturity, as apparent and as beautiful as that which transforms the sapling into the broad and sturdy tree. The Fidei Ratio lays the foundations for the Confession of Basle; the Confession of Basle becomes the basis of the first Helvetic Confession. The several Swiss symbols, springing as crystal fountains from their Alpine sources, pour their clear current into the creeds of the Palatinate of France and of distant Scotland; and these in time become tributary to those later canons and confessions, in which the Calvinistic system is regarded as having found its most complete expression.

---

could not sufficiently express my sorrow over the divisions and distractions of Christendom!"

With this sentiment Calvin was in complete sympathy. The desire for conciliation, for harmony of view as well as feeling, and even for a great Protestant Union, grew stronger and stronger in his breast. His correspondence with leading Reformers in other countries furnishes numerous illustrations of this fact. Among the Zurich letters, there is one, in response from Archbishop Cranmer, urging the importance of harmony in teaching, and of concert in action, for the furtherance of the Protestant doctrine, and closing with the question: Shall we neglect to call together a Godly Synod, for the refutation of error, and for restoring and propagating the truth?

Geographically, this development began at Zürich and at Basle; thence it extended to the seven Protestant cantons, and embraced the whole of evangelized Switzerland; thence it penetrated northward and westward, like the widening rays of the morning, until it had comprehended France and the Palatinate: and still it grew broader and more comprehensive, until Holland and England, and even remote Scotland, were incircled by it. Limited by Lutheranism on the east, and by Rome on the south, it thus went forth from its Helvetic centre to plant its standards in the north and west, and to bear its noble part in the subduing of these various nationalities unto Christ.

It began in like manner with individual effort; and in the independent reflections and declarations of men like Luther and Zwingli, and Bucer and Calvin and Knox. But no individual mind—not even that of the sage and scholar of Geneva—could fully comprehend or control it. In the second Helvetic Confession, the Swiss theologians were all associated; the Heidelberg Catechism, though proposed chiefly by Ursinus, was supervised by the bishops and ministry of the Palatinate; two successive synods of French Protestants set their imprimatur upon the Gallic Confession; the articles of Cranmer and Ridley received the endorsement of both bishops and synods, and the British Parliament, before they became the authorized faith of England. And in the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly, we find the agency in this development becoming still more extensive and august, each of these Councils assuming national magnitude, and taking on in some aspects even an ecumenical importance.

There are some internal signs of such growth, which especially attract the observer. At first the Zwinglian doctrine concerning the sacraments, having been the primary occasion of diversity among the Reformers, was invested with a disproportionate prominence, and affirmed with excessive tenacity and zeal; but gradually we find it, without losing its distinctive character, settling into an appropriate place, and taking on its just proportions. At the beginning other doctrines, which now constitute essential parts of the Calvinistic system,

were either briefly stated or wholly omitted; but by degrees these claimed their legitimate positions, and were welcomed into the harmonious household of sacred truth. At the outset some tenets were set forth with less of expansion and less of precision than was requisite in symbols aiming at completeness; but gradually such definitions were enlarged, balanced, rounded out into appropriate symmetry. At first these Confessions were provincial in cast and form as well as in authoritativeness, framed to meet special exigencies, and restricted by the narrowness of the occasions that elicited them, and consequently unfitted for transportation from one province or state to another, and wholly incompetent to be the one universal creed of the various nations represented in the Reformed movement. But by degrees such an ecumenical element enters into them, and they grow into some measure of universality; the Catechism of Heidleburg and the Canons of Dort find acceptance in all Calvinistic circles; and the Confession of Westminster is not only received with respect wherever Calvinism has foothold in Europe, but becomes its revered symbol on a new continent, and is the accepted creed even of multitudes who reject the Presbyterian name.

IV. This organic growth is characterized by much of *circumstantial diversity*. In the preface to the "Variations," the subtle Bossuet traces such diversity to two related causes—one found in the liability of the human mind, after having once shaken off the restraints of divine authority, to become involved hopelessly in the mazes of rational speculation; the other revealed in the incapacity of such minds, after having agreed in rejecting the common standard of divine truth, and the common obligation to submit to its guidance, thenceforth to agree upon any given statement of sacred doctrine.\* He

\* "Catholic truth, proceeding from God, hath its perfection at once; heresy, a weak offspring of the human mind, can no otherwise be formed than of patched-up and ill-suiting parts. When, contrary to God's commandment, man ventures to remove the ancient land-marks set by his forefathers, and reform the doctrine received once amongst the faithful, he launches forth, without a thorough insight into all the consequences from what he first advanced; what a false twilight made him thus venture on, is afterwards found big with such inconsistencies as oblige these Reformers every day to reform themselves; nor can they know when their innovations will have an end, and they rest satisfied." *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*: Preface.

further points to the number of the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions, as evidence that no section of the Protestant party was able to present the truth in such a manner as to win the acceptance of the rest; and as decisive proof that all were wandering by various paths from the holy and catholic faith.

Against the Lutheran branch of that party, this charge must be pronounced invalid and unjust, since the several Lutheran symbols, from the Articles of Torgau to the Formula Concordiæ, were merely preparations for, or explanations of, the *Confessio Augusta* of Augsburg, in which the doctrine of the German churches received its substantial exposition. Whatever local or casual confessions sprang up within the limits of Lutheranism, beyond these preparatory or explanatory formularies, originated in geographical or political causes, indicating no vital want of harmony among the wise and earnest minds by whom this exposition of doctrine was conducted—and so far as the number and the variety of the Reformed symbols are concerned, we shall find the explanation mainly in such external causes; we shall recognize outward occasions leading to such diversity, and perhaps necessitating it, while at the same time no essential variations or contradictions are developed in the process.

Lutheranism was German—limited chiefly to a single nationality, held together by one language, and by numberless other agencies, which almost made it necessary that the Protestant movement within its borders should be one and indivisible. The Reformed churches were spread through several nationalities, differing in speech and usage, unlike in civil and social condition, and widely separated from one another. They were divided by geographical and political lines; and their local and provincial organizations naturally accepted the boundaries of the state as their proper limit. Switzerland furnished one sphere of development and France another; the Palatinate and the Netherlands were separate from these, and from one another; while the churches of England and Scotland, divided from the rest by influences broader than the seas that flowed between, assumed of necessity an independent attitude, and framed the common doctrine in a language and style peculiar to themselves.

This necessity becomes the more obvious, and the less significant as a basis of criticism, when we remember how greatly the entire Protestant movement was effected and embarrassed by political complications. The relations subsisting between the Church and the State were too intimate on the one side, and too vague and indeterminate on the other: the idea of a complete separation was one which only the experience of two subsequent centuries could bring into view. The history of the era is therefore a history of continual interference by the civil authorities, not merely with questions of organization, but even with views and expositions of doctrine. Princes assumed the right to call councils, and then to influence or control their action; kings took upon themselves the responsibility of providing creeds for their subjects. As the various churches in each province or nation were constituted one church, each of these provincial or national churches naturally constructed its own Confession; and thus the Reformed doctrine assumed many forms, varying in language and style, in the relative adjustment of particular tenets, and in the measure of completeness attained. Such variety was inevitable under the circumstances; and when Bossuet demanded that these multiplied churches and organizations, scattered throughout Western and Northern Europe, separated by diversities of language and custom, divided by broad political lines, unfamiliar with one another, and involved in the earnest struggles and labors incident to such a movement as Protestantism then was, should spontaneously agree upon one single Confession of Faith, this demand was both unreasonable and unjust.

It may be freely admitted, also, that the influence of individual minds, thinking and acting independently of each other, and sometimes in unconscious or open opposition, tended to develop such multiplicity and variety in doctrinal statement. While, on the one hand, we are interested in watching the reciprocal action of such minds, and in noting how far the strong and absorbing devotion to one great, central truth drew them into union, we should also recognize their strict individualism, their comparative isolation, and even their positive antagonisms. The mutual trust and love of men so unlike as Lu-

ther and Melancthon testify in no ordinary sense to their essential oneness in Christ ; the collisions in sentiment and feeling between men like Luther and Zwingli were but the natural outgrowth of differences inherent in their constitution, and cultivated by widely varied experiences. Such collisions were far less frequent and less serious than any candid student of human nature would have anticipated ; and in the manner in which they were checked or repressed, the believer in the reconciling agency of the Holy Spirit may find touching confirmation of his faith. But simple isolation in space and in time doubtless tended far more decidedly than such personal antagonisms to produce the variety in doctrinal opinion, illustrated in the Reformed symbols. The distance between Geneva and Edinburgh, between Wittenberg and Leyden, was then a hundred fold greater than now ; and the intercommunication between minds thus separated geographically was then obstructed in similar ratio. A corresponding distance in time separated Luther from John Knox, Zwingli and Bucer from Nesinus and Olivianus, Heidegger and Turretin from the leading minds in the Synod of Dort. And these separating occasions, geographic and otherwise, induced of necessity corresponding varieties, not only in forms of expression and in the mere structure of belief, but even in shades of doctrine and the real essence of the faith. To expect any other development than this under such conditions, is a mistake into which a mind so clear and profound as that of Bossuet could never have fallen ; his demand for complete unity must have been as insincere as it was unphilosophic.

No friend of the Reformed doctrine need hesitate, on the other hand, to admit the existence of internal as well as external occasions for diversity in the Calvinistic symbols. Some individuals, and some branches of the Reformed Church, for example, accepted more distinctively, and applied more thoroughly than others, the Augustinian theory of human nature. While all were agreed in rejecting Pelagianism, even in its milder and more plausible forms, and were substantially one in their convictions respecting the fall and depravity and guilt of mankind, they differed somewhat in the degree of stress



and stringency with which they presented the received truth. In like manner, some accepted more positively than others, and more carefully carried out to their logical results, the views of divine sovereignty and control which lay at the foundation of the theology of Calvin, and in which that theology diverged most widely from the teaching of the later Lutheranism. Some were inclined, like the authors of the Catechism of Heidelberg, to state these doctrines, and those logically consequent upon them, in the most conciliatory form, and for the purpose of securing the assent of thoughtful Lutherans as well as Calvinists; others were animated, like the Synod of Dort, by more of the polemic spirit, and impelled by the conscious necessity of drawing as broadly and plainly as possible the lines which separated Calvinism from the Arminianism then seeking to subvert it. The Reformers were not all cast in one mould, or placed in one set of circumstances. They differed in respect to logical capacity, comprehensiveness of vision, scholarly precision, and multiplied other characteristics, which were tributary to the framing of their several Confessions of Faith. They were greatly unlike both in natural temperament and in spiritual experience; their surroundings were as diversified as were the countries in which they lived; their preparatory training and discipline had been very dissimilar; diverse exigencies pressed at different periods upon the several branches or sections of the church; and many of their creeds were shaped to meet these immediate exigencies. Each branch or section had its own enemies, its own dangers, its own internal needs, and, consequently, its own answer to give to every man that sought a reason for the doctrine it maintained. The aggregate of such answers, historically compiled and collated, must therefore present no flat and dead uniformity, but rather an unique and suggestive variety, harmonizing spontaneously rather than by design, and strongly indicative in every part of the common life in Christ animating all alike.

V. In contrast with such variety in form and feature, the growth under examination must be regarded as *a growth in and toward unity*. The Reformed symbols present to our

view not merely a geographical contiguity, or a succession in time, or a series of independent products, standing together simply as the separate trees of one luxuriant forest. They are to be regarded rather as Calvinism, first in the blade, and then in the ear, and afterwards maturing into the full and perfect corn; as the successive stages and results of a process, which, if we may compare human things with divine, is not unlike that by which the Scriptures, under a multiplicity of form and through twenty centuries of time, grew by various authorship into that Book of books, whose indestructible unity becomes at last one of the clearest witnesses to its divine origin and mission.

Every intelligent mind appreciates the just distinction between the essence of a doctrine and its accidents or accessories; between the fact incorporated in a dogmatic statement and the theory or theories employed to account for that fact; between the essential truth affirmed in an article of belief and the explanations or illustrations introduced in exposition of the truth. One of the Reformed Confessions \* quaintly recognizes this distinction in its simple and yet decisive doctrine respecting Original Sin. After affirming that the posterity of Adam are affected by his fall in some way of hereditary contagion, rather than through mere example and imitation, as Pelagians were asserting, it adds the words: "*Nor do we deem it necessary to inquire just how this sinfulness passes from one to another; it is enough to believe that what God brought upon Adam, affected not himself merely, but likewise his entire race.*" In immediate opposition with this statement may be placed the recent affirmation of an eminent teacher of Calvinism, in our times: "Original Sin is one thing, the way in which it is accounted for is another. The doctrine is, that such is the relation between Adam and his posterity, that all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, are born in a state of sin and condemnation. Any man who admits this holds the doctrine."† Principal Cunningham, in his *Historical Theology*, affirms still more broadly,

\* Niemeyer. *Confessio Gallicana*: Art. x.

† Dr. Hodges in *Princeton Review*, July, 1867.

that no man pretends to be able to comprehend or explain the doctrine of the fall of Adam, and its bearing upon the present character and condition of men; that it involves mysteries which human reason, enlightened by divine revelation, can not fathom; and that, after all our study of Scripture, and all our investigation of the subject, we must resolve the matter into the divine sovereignty, and be content to say: "Even so, Father, for so it hath seemed good in thy sight."

The same distinction may be illustrated by reference to other doctrines in the Calvinistic system. We assert the fact of the divine sovereignty, and the antithetic fact of human freedom, and carefully incorporate both in our doctrinal belief; meanwhile accepting or rejecting any proposed explanation of the mystery involved in this combination, or bowing down before that sacred mystery with mute confession of our inability to solve it. We affirm the great fact of an election, as exhibited both in the providence and in the gracious dealings of God with men, while we differ as to the value of any specific exposition of the fact, or confess ourselves unable to elucidate, or even to comprehend it. We avow our faith in the presence and operations of the Holy Ghost, and confess our dependence upon him for every holy thought or righteous act; reverently casting ourselves upon his gracious interposition, though we can not recognise his presence by any sense, or penetrate in the least into the mystery of his efficiency. All the cardinal truths of our religion, and especially those which are essential parts of our Calvinistic belief, are like mountains, whose gilded summits we clearly see, and whose main outlines we more or less vaguely discern, but whose deep foundations lie concealed in the comprehending wisdom of him by whom the facts themselves were graciously revealed for our salvation. And while we welcome any explanations which human reason can give—while we rejoice in every suggestion of wise and sound philosophy, and forever linger around the vast problems involved in these cardinal truths, the essential and the sanctifying act in each case is an act of faith; and this act of faith embraces neither theory nor speculation, but the facts alone.

Viewed in the light of this distinction, the unity of the Reformed Symbols, so far as these specific doctrines are concerned, becomes very clear. The same note may be sounded by several different instruments, varying in structure and form; and the tone of each may be clearly discernible from those of the rest; while the ear of the listener plainly perceives that the sound, whether breathed from a flute or poured from an organ, is one and the same. As we hear the several notes which are combined in the grand and solemn octave of our Calvinistic faith, sounded forth from one creed after another, we spontaneously recognize the identity of each among these sacred tones, from whichever source it flows. The facts, the doctrines, the substantial verities presented as objects of faith, are ever the same, even while subordinate variations or diversities are apparent on every hand.

This growth in and toward unity is exhibited also in the progressive adjustment and combination of such separate truths or doctrines. The question of adjustment and combination engrossed, at the outset, but little attention. The minds of the earlier Reformers were occupied rather with the clear, positive, independent statement of those particular doctrines in which they differed from the Papacy, or varied among themselves. It was reserved for the organizing intellect of later leaders to bring these particular truths together, and to state them in their connections both with one another, and with those other verities which are united with these in the Gospel of Christ. And as there were differences in the degree of clearness, exactness, comprehensiveness, force, with which the truth was first stated particularly, so there were differences in the degree of success attained in the combining of these various elements in the several creeds constructed. The materials are in some cases less ample and less adequate than in others; the order of construction varies according to the plan and object of the architects; the completed edifice bears traces of the poverty and the peculiarities, as well as of the sublime faith, of its occupants.

And yet this question of adjustment and combination is one of vital importance in the scientific evolutions of Christian doc-

trine. Chemists tell us not only that exactly the same elements, united in different proportions, become in one combination indispensable to human life, and in another deleterious and destructive, but also that the same elements, united in the same proportions, but existing in one case as a vegetable growth, and in another as a chemical mixture, are in like manner healthful and nutritious in the first instance, but noxious or deadly in the other. A preacher may believe in all the essential doctrines of grace, and be recognized as orthodox on every point, and yet by his disproportionate presentation of any single doctrine or any class of doctrines, convey inadequate and even ruinous conceptions of the gospel as a whole. Such a preacher may hold and proclaim the doctrines of grace in due proportions, and yet his proclamation of them may be corrupted by a spirit so diverse from that of Christ, as to become a savor of death to those who hear him. In the study of the Reformed Symbolism, we detect a palpable and beautiful advance in both of these particulars. Proportion and symmetry on the one hand, are evidently the object of a growing desire: the harmonies of truth begin to be heard above the sounds of eager discussion: the whole of Sacred Doctrine is seen to be greater than any of its parts: and by degrees the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Confession come into view, as the most complete and balanced, and therefore healthful and nutritious, expositions of the common faith. On the other hand, the baleful spirit of partizanship, tenacious of particular phases of thought, and devoted to some specific form of organization, gradually loses its power: polemic contests become less prominent and absorbing: dogmatism gives way before the sense of brotherhood: an improved type of religious experience softens, hallows, beautifies the creeds: and by degrees those creeds become, through many variations, the one Calvinistic Faith.

VI. Of this long process of growth or development in which the Reformed churches throughout Northern and Western Europe shared together during more than a century, *the Westminster Confession was both the latest and the most complete and perfect fruit.* Both historically and logically, it should

be regarded as the culmination of the entire series of Reformed Symbols. In the manner of its construction, in the completeness of its form, and in the spirit which animates it, as well as in its historical position and relations, it may fitly claim precedence above any antecedent Confession, and is justly deserving of the wider acceptance, and of the greater measure of authoritativeness, which it has attained wherever Calvinism is known or received.

Never since the Diet at Augsburg had a body of men been convened for any kindred purpose, who could compare in ability and in character with the Westminster Assembly. Though British in nationality, they were European in reputation, and ecumenical in influence. They were familiar with the peculiarities of the Reformed churches everywhere, and acquainted with the whole course of Calvinistic teaching and belief. Before them lay the scrolls on which were transcribed all that had been solemnly affirmed by other branches of the Reformed stock; around them were strewed the writings of those who had been the fathers and counsellors of the church for more than a century. They were happily removed to a safe distance from those unfavorable excitements by which the mind and hearts of many among the earlier advocates of Calvinism had been as frequently biased. They were surrounded by no such angry controversies—assailed by no such serious errors, as those which influenced so distinctly the decisions of the Synod of Dort. They were permitted to conduct their deliberations at great length, and in comparative peace; and their conclusions were framed with a degree of literary exactness, of philosophic system, of fraternal harmony, such as finds no counterpart in any preceding council. They were animated also by the hope that their action would not only secure the union of the Calvinistic churches in England and Scotland, but would likewise contribute to the visible combination and fellowship of all other churches bearing the Calvinistic name.\* And, as their work has shown, their

\* In the introductory sermon, preached by Dr. Lymington, at the Bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly, held at Edinburgh in 1843, the following sentences occur:

"They contemplated, besides a religious uniformity in the three kingdoms, a great Pro-



capacity was equal to their aims; their abilities were happily proportioned to their position, and to the great task Providentially assigned them. By culture and experience, as well as by occasion and appointment, they were admirably qualified for their work; and eight successive generations of Calvinists bear grateful witness to the success with which they performed it.

The Confession of Faith which these men framed, taken in conjunction with the Catechisms, contains a most exact, harmonious and complete statement of the Reformed doctrine. It is surpassed by none among the antecedent Confessions; the Catechism of Heidelberg alone may claim an equal recognition. In its definition of particular doctrines it avoids for the most part both the indefiniteness characteristic of some earlier symbols, and the exaggeration that defaces the decisions of the Synod of Dort. It generally presents specific truth, neither in the imagery of rhetoric nor in the tenacious phrases of dogmatism, but in the calm, sensible, convincing language of Christian wisdom. While it reduces some truths to a less conspicuous level, and omits certain affirmations of earlier creeds as not essential to the system, it introduces some incidental and explanatory statements which the earlier symbolism had not fully perceived. It aims to present the doctrines of grace in their logical succession, as well as in their individual completeness, and to adjust them to one another in such ways as to preserve the divine proportion and symmetry of the whole. The relations of doctrine to doctrine are more carefully indicated; the unity of the several members in the one body of faith is more diligently preserved; that faith is presented, not as a chemical mixture, but rather as an organic and healthful growth. Very little can be found in any antecedent Confession which is not as carefully incorporated and as happily expressed in this; the whole current of preceding

---

testant union among the nations of Christendom. . . . No sectarian prejudice, no weak partiality of kindred or of country, were permitted to freeze or confine the current of holy feeling that flowed in their bosoms. . . . They opened correspondence with foreign churches, and in the largeness and warmth of their affections formed schemes of co-operation and intercourse, which they were not permitted to see realized. The Symbols they framed were so constructed as to exhibit a generous and catholic bearing, being equally adapted to the Church in Britain, on the continent of Europe, in the Republican States of America."<sup>7</sup>

symbolism seems to have been poured into this clarifying and distributing reservoir. And if we sometimes discover a lack of definiteness in statement, on one hand, or an excessive straining after philosophic exactness on the other—if we occasionally detect the influence of a particular type of speculation, or note the introduction of some theory in connection with a truth or fact—if here and there we see a lack of proportion, or an imperfection in the combination of antithetic elements—if we perceive that something of human infirmity and inadequacy mingles with this, as with all other transcripts by man of the word and truth of God—we may still greatly and reverently receive this noble Symbol, made venerable by two centuries of acceptance, as being the nearest approach which the mind of the Church has made as yet toward that Divine Original, on which our faith and hope ultimately and supremely repose.

There is one respect in which the Westminster Confession may especially claim the esteem of all who regard true piety as equally essential with sound doctrine, and who are disposed to test all creeds and symbols by the measure of spirituality pervading them. That company of grave men, illustrating in deportment as in dress the peculiar style of the age, proceeding in their work with such solemn dignity, and by their whole demeanor making still more reverend the venerable place where they were assembled, were by no means the cold, critical, scholastic theologians whom many have imagined. With few exceptions, they were intensely earnest, devout, spiritual men; and their convocations were characterized by no ordinary measure and glow of truly Christian devotion.\* And it is one of

---

\*We gain some insight into the religious condition of the Assembly, and into the spirit with which its members entered on the work before them, from the quaint record of Baillie, one of the Scotch commissioners, concerning a certain day of fasting: "After Dr. Zwisse had begun with a brief prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed large two hours, most divinely, confessing the sins of the members of Assembly, in a wonderfully pathetic and prudent way. After, Dr. Arrowsmith preached one hour: then a psalm: thereafter Mr. Vines prayed two hours, and Mr. Palmer preached one hour, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two hours: then a psalm. After, Mr. Henderson brought them to a short, sweet conference of the heart-confessed and other seen faults to be remedied. Dr. Zwisse closed with a short prayer and blessing. *And yet this day was the sweetest that I have seen in England.*"

the peculiar excellences of their Confession and Catechisms, that they are pervaded and sanctified by this spiritual quality, rising far above all mere accuracy or comprehensiveness of statement, and vitalizing the entire system or body of doctrine proclaimed therein. It is questionable whether they do not surpass all antecedent Confessions quite as much in this, as in their exposition of the common faith. There is indeed a certain ruder earnestness and fervor in some of these—a certain intensity of expression and display of personal convictions, for which we find no exact counterpart in the Westminster symbols: but these characteristics are counterbalanced by a maturity of experience, a calm elevation, a ripened and settled piety, which all must recognize as a still higher and nobler gift from God. And it may be further questioned, whether it be not the possession of this signal spirituality, quite as much as any doctrinal accuracy or completeness—this exhibition of the truth of God in forms and phrases, such as vital piety no less than sound theology suggests, which has given to these symbols such a special place in Christian hearts, and exalted them to such peculiar eminence among the accepted formularies of the Christian Church.

Such a confession as this, set in such historic relations, and interpreted by comparison with the Reformed symbols which preceded it, and poured their several contributions into it, may fitly claim the allegiance of all who call themselves by the Calvinistic, rather than the Arminian name. To ignore the historic origin of this Confession, or disregard the complex process of research, discussion, declaration, which went before it and made it possible—to interpret it without reference to that century of growth and conflict of which it was the bright, consummate flower, or accept it in any other than its proper historical sense as thus supplied, is a mistake of which no intelligent Calvinist should be guilty. A sound interpretation, a true and worthy acceptance of this Confession, involve sincere recognition and approval of that compact, massive, grand **SYSTEM OF DOCTRINE** which, in varying measure, was embodied in such antecedent symbols, and which has been so fully incorporated and matured in this; a recognition which heartily re-

ceives the system in every essential element, even while questioning merely incidental or explanatory features; an approval which embraces the substance of the doctrine, and rejoices in it, even while unable to accept such philosophic speculations as may be mingled therewith. So long as the integrity of that system, the unity and symmetry of that doctrine, are preserved by those who recognize and approve this Confession, such variety of judgment concerning what is speculative or incidental, and a corresponding variety in methods of stating or illustrating these precious verities, must be allowed, as a necessary concession to liberty of thought. Neither is it essential to presume that no traces of error are to be found in this noble Confession, or in the series of Confessions which culminated in it: since the Assembly are themselves careful to teach that synods and councils may err, and have erred; and that their decisions are therefore not to be taken as the *RULE* of faith or practice, but are rather to be used as helps in both practice and faith. Still less does such acceptance require us to assume that, while human language and human thought are constantly undergoing modifications under influences both natural and supernatural, no structural changes are ever to take place in this System of Doctrine, involving correspondent changes in the formulary that defines it. It is needful only that—leaving to the church of the future the expression of its own faith under the leadings of the Word and Spirit of God, allowing ample room for present inquiry and discussion, consenting to varieties of illustration and explanation within legitimate limits, and bearing and forbearing one another in love—we cordially receive and adopt this sublime Confession, in its plain historic sense and relations, as an adequate, authoritative, precious transcript of that System of Doctrine which all agree in accepting as contained, not in the writings of Calvin, but in the Holy Scriptures of God.

## ART. III.—BIBLICAL PREACHING.

By J. B. CONDIT, D. D., Professor in Auburn Seminary.

THE HISTORY of the pulpit is identified with that of the church and the victories of truth. This gives it a singular distinction, and renders it worthy of our study in the elements of its power and adaptation to the age. There are no indications of diminished interest on this subject. The nature and sphere of the ministerial office ensure the popular sympathy, while the treatises on Homiletics put forth during the last few years, have done much to call attention to the claims of this sacred trust.

The conviction exists, to some extent, that the influence of the pulpit on the popular mind is declining; and various suggestions are made as to the cause and the remedy. This conviction, as entertained by many, is quite indefinite. It is acknowledged that the ministry does not in all respects occupy the position which it did some fifty years ago; but this does not necessarily imply that the essential power of the pulpit has declined. Without bringing this question into the present discussion, we accept the common admission that there is need of increasing the efficiency of the ministry. The attempt to contribute something to this end is not unseasonable.

The true method of elevating the standard of the pulpit has been the subject of investigation by the best minds. When that method shall be determined, it will probably have little of novelty, but will be the result of a wise application of long established principles. It is easy to make general statements concerning the object to be attained and the way of attaining it, but it is not so easy to offer a specific theory in which all will agree. When we hear so much about power in preaching, and the qualifications for attracting and impressing mind, we should infer that a pattern has been adopted, and that a man who is moulded according to it will exemplify, in its highest type, the eloquence of the pulpit. But we should look far before we should find that specimen of a modern preacher that would suit the theories of all the critics. The judgment of

some pertains to the intrinsic qualities of the Christian orator. They would make their voice heard in behalf of those elements of power which lie at the foundation of sacred eloquence. But the voice of others arrests our attention to things which are only exterior or incidental. Perhaps they find something indispensable in the sharp, quaint style of a Thomas Fuller, or a Hugh Latimer. Some regard the pulpit as tame and jejune, unless it receive a plentiful infusion of the "satire and invective" of South. There are others who would impart new interest to the old truths of Christianity by creating a new vesture with which to clothe them—a vesture of mystic, ethereal texture. Such prescriptions fall short of the necessity. The character and relations of the pulpit conduct us to things that lie deeper; to the springs of mental effort, and the fundamental sources of moral power. They have a just appreciation of what is needed for the pulpit in this country, who demand more of that sound teaching and holy unction which a large infusion of the Biblical element would give it. They affirm that it has come under the influence of a corrupt public sentiment, so as either to supplant in a measure the spiritual themes of the Gospel, or promote a style in preaching them which is less direct and pungent than that of our fathers. Who will say this charge of accommodation to the spirit of a false liberality is altogether without foundation? Who will disregard these words of warning, as if they were not the dictate of a righteous sensibility? The place which God has given to the Christian ministry forbids us to wink at the tendency to put in the back-ground his written Word. In every just analysis of the constituents of effective preaching, we must give the supremacy to the faithful, skillful use of that Word. It is not then without reason that we propose to show *the nature and value of Biblical Preaching*.

I. The primary idea in Biblical Preaching is a theology derived directly from the Bible. This will be the result of a reverent, earnest purpose to get lessons for the pulpit in the form and relation in which God has given them, instead of accepting as a guide any system constructed by a human mind. It will be the fruit of close sympathy and contact with the thoughts



of the Spirit in their original dress. However varied and accurate may be the preacher's knowledge of systems of doctrine, if he is intent on preaching a Biblical theology, and successful in it, he will be the student of the text, with a trained intellect and a loving devotion. Doctrinal formulas and treatises have their value. As they represent the theological development in different periods of the past, they are an important department of the history of the Church. They are a study for the Christian scholar. But often in the crude fancy and false philosophy which they contain, they warn us against trusting to human teachers. The Scriptural preacher will elevate the Bible alike above ancient and modern systems, by whatever names they are certified, so that they shall not be the source or guide of his teaching.

But it is important to define more particularly the process of developing a theology out of the Bible, and the form in which the Bible will manifest its presence and agency in preaching.

There are two modes of using the Bible in the work of preaching. One consists in reasoning truth directly out of the Scriptures; the other, in reasoning into them what we conceive to be truth. The first was the method of Paul. Thus it is said of him when at Thessalonica: "He went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging" the truth respecting Christ. This implies an exposition and enforcement of the divine declarations on that subject. The foundation of such reasoning is laid in Biblical interpretation. Its positions are determined and fortified by unfolding the sacred text.

We have here a guide for the use of reason in preaching the Gospel. Its decision being given that the Bible is a divine revelation, the preachers must consecrate it as the servant of inspired truth, to define and enforce the import of the language in which God has communicated it. It is not its office to institute hypotheses or frame propositions outside the teachings of the Spirit; but as an instrument in the use of those teachings, to accomplish the end for which they were given. It must work under all the restrictions which the divine au-

thority of revelation imposes. It must bow with reverence and docility in the presence of the "Great Teacher," and receive its lessons from him. As it hears the cry from inquiring minds, "What is truth?" it must give the answer by interpreting the voice of the Holy Spirit.

While reason is thus guided, it can work with the scope and freedom demanded by the relations of truth to the intellect, the conscience and the heart. It is God's appointment that through the pulpit truth should be established and applied in the way best adapted to conviction. Men are not reasoned into the kingdom. No urgency of human persuasion achieves the subjection of the will to divine authority. Depravity will never succumb under the force of logic. It directly affects the action of mind in relation to truth. Man is a doubter, not because he is a reasoner, but because he reasons under the influence of a corrupt bias. At the very threshold of the understanding, truth is questioned and resisted. The intellect, clear and keen in the discernment of what is true on the other subjects, falters here. But while human reasoning is in itself powerless in respect to this moral blindness and corruption, it is, in connection with truth, clear and well-defined that God achieves the submission of the heart. It is according to the divine economy in saving souls, that the truth should be so exhibited as not only to make men think, but think rightly; confounding their false reasoning, and exacting the tribute of the intellect to the voice of God, as preparatory to their feeling the power of truth.

In Biblical reasoning, this simple question determines the action of the preacher's mind: What is the exact meaning of the Word, and how can it be made clear and convincing to the minds of the hearers? He never leaves the stronghold of inspiration. There he lays his foundations; there he finds the substantial material for building the superstructure. This doctrine shines on every side with the light shed upon it by the Spirit. As he unfolds its nature, defines its boundaries and presses its claims, he marshals his thoughts in the order and majesty of a Scriptural demonstration. This is very different from a cold, abstract ratiocination—a form dry and stiff,

into which a living soul has not been breathed. Such reasoning may have auroral brilliancy, but it has no genial, penetrating sunlight. It may dazzle, but it does not pierce. It may make a large draft on mind to comprehend it, but its force is expended without reaching man's deep, inner convictions. It takes a form and direction foreign to the sympathies and cravings of the soul. Those persons are prone to this style who, in their fondness for great elaboration in reasoning, are chiefly employed with what have been called the "interior truths" of revelation. This is a restriction in the range of pulpit themes which is apt to be fatal to simplicity and unction. A corrective for this tendency may be found in the habit of John Owen, who said he "delighted in a more free and wider scope of ranging through the most pleasant meads of the Holy Scriptures, and contemplating in these the transparent fountains of life and rivers of consolation."

But we need to mark more carefully that reasoning which is *not* "out of the Scriptures." Reason sometimes elevates itself as a discoverer. Truth is treated as a matter of speculation, or the result of human search, rather than the direct revelation from Heaven. To expound unto men the ways of God more perfectly, is made to consist in piercing into regions beyond the disclosures of the Spirit. The preacher who carries out this idea is indebted to the Bible for little besides his text. He puts his subject in every light but that reflected from the sacred page. He does not construct his theories on a divine foundation. The movements of his mind are not guided by the authority of the Word. Difficulties in religion are met with little regard to the decision of the Divine Mind. He answers the question, "How can these things be? as if man was wise beyond what is written, and able to solve all questions which the Bible has left unsolved. His periods rise, but the climax is not radiant with heaven's light. One position after another is taken, but no one in the series is made strong with the defenses of revelation. There may be bright intellection and confident assertion; but the Word of God does not pervade the whole with its light and power. Such a mind, in its independence, working out an answer to an im-

portant question, is likely to strike a blow at some point in the foundations of the system of truth. We sometimes see it turn away entirely from the central source of light, and lose itself in a trackless region of fancy. It bounds into a sphere for which no chart is made and no points of calculation are given. While embosomed in clouds, it professes to have light within which the uninitiated can not perceive; though, when regarded from a Scriptural position, it is plain that it puts darkness for light. Warped by a deranged moral nature, or captivated with the charm of novelties, it casts off the sacred barriers of principle, bounds onward with fearful strides, and sheds around an atmosphere deleterious to the spiritual health of all who breathe it. The multitude may not follow such a preacher in all the range of his discoveries; yet he sends back the fruit of his search, commended to the general taste by their novelty, and the fragrance of that paradise of the imagination in which he is revelling. At length, reputed as the "Priest of certain mysteries," which common sense fails to penetrate, he gathers some sympathizing minds into the outer court of the temple, who blindly accept the responses of the self-constituted oracle. Instead of bringing reason into the service of truth, to open and enforce it in its original simplicity, he has assigned it the office of an explorer beyond the lines of revelation.

We can now present, in few words, the method in which the Biblical preacher will execute his trust. (1.) It will be his great, chosen work to expound the language of the Holy Spirit. Either by consecutive exposition, or in the use of selected portions of Scripture, he will give to his people a theology which has the stamp, and is full of the essence, of the divine Word. Exegesis will be a characteristic of his pulpit. (2.) In enforcing doctrine and duty he will use the Bible as the grand source of argument and motive. His reasoning and persuasion will have the impress of a reverent intellect which exalts divine authority. (3.) His preaching will abound in illustrations drawn from the Scriptures, which are full of picture, incident and varied moral scenery, adapted to make truth vivid and impressive. (4.) The spirit of the Word will per-

vade all his utterances. He will go into the heart of the text to get the living germ, of which his sermons will be the development. He will go beneath the shell and find the kernel; beneath the letter and bring out the "spirit" and the "life." He will so expand the thoughts of Paul and John and Peter, that they will speak through him. He will not merely attach the words of inspiration to the body of a discourse, but will so infuse their spirit into that body that it will be as the life-blood flowing through it, and imparting to it freshness and vigor. Nothing short of this can be accepted as constituting a Biblical pulpit. This will everywhere be recognized as such, in the doctrine inculcated, and in the manner of teaching it; in distinction from that pulpit, which, in its themes, discussions and prevalent spirit, exalts the human rather than the divine elements of attraction.

II. The value of this Biblical element in relation to the power of the pulpit demands consideration.

1. The Biblical preacher secures that source of power which consists in *official fidelity*. It is the special commission of the minister of Christ to unfold the divine message. As Christ's ambassador, he adds moral power to his character and appeals, when he is even intent on expounding the import and enforcing the claims of this message. In this way he magnifies his office. If he deals out the dialectics of the philosopher, the speculations of the theorist, or the "common-places" of the circulating lecturer, instead of faithfully interpreting the doctrines which contain the will of his Sovereign, he sacrifices that primary element of strength which consists in being true to the nature and design of his office. Let it appear that the path in which he is leading souls, is that which is made clear and bright with light from the lamp of divine truth; that he never substitutes for this any light of his own kindling; that the wealth of thought in the Bible ever enriches his pulpit; then men will yield him their confidence and sympathy. There is power in the atmosphere that encircles him. Trustful, reverent hearers gather around his pulpit. Mind opens without suspicion to the entrance of his words.

2. It is the source of *authority* in preaching. The charac-

teristics of the preacher's mind will be impressed on his own manner of exhibiting truth. Yet, as he encompasses and pervades his utterances with the divine voice, his preaching will be, substantially, a "Thus saith the Lord." No attributes of the man can compensate for the absence of this. There may be invention and taste, a keen logic and a finished rhetoric; his thoughts may glitter with an earthly light; the lovers of novelty and the worshippers of the beautiful may decree to him the supremacy in the eloquence of the pulpit; but the authority is wanting which belongs to a simple unfolding of the message of God. That is wanting which will satisfy the inquiring mind; for it seeks an answer to its questions which bears the stamp of divine authority. It wants to hear what God speaks.

It is not the air of authority which appears in the style of dogmatism or dictation. It is not that show of it which is derived from the Church, attested by outward signs and symbols—"the robe of costly stuff, flowing fullness and heavy fold." It is not that which one throws around his message, by a frequent, emphatic reference to the name of God, as the source of his commission. This is of little worth, and is often repulsive, when there is nothing else to impress such a fact on the mind. There ought to be that tone of the voice, that look of the eye, that action and style of address, which will convey the idea that he speaks under the deep conviction of a messenger of God. But this element of power must pervade the very texture of the sermon. If not found there, other genuine signs of it will hardly be expected.

The preacher meets men on this foundation—"all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." The power of this fact is great when it is boldly recognized in his manner of preaching. Then his reasoning has a force which silences objection. His argument is rooted in the divine Word; its process is guided by it; the seal of Heaven stamps it. A sound, complete Scriptural argument is a perfect demonstration. Who shall question it? There is a force in truth directly evolved from the Word of God—fortified and inspirited with it in all its amplification, which arrests mind and carries it trium-



phantly to the conclusion. It is something above the eloquence of man and the logic of the schools. The language of Nature is in harmony with the voice of God in the Bible; her ten thousand voices confirm it. Providence speaks in lessons that vividly illustrate it. There is a voice sometimes coming up from the depths of the soul, responsive to that of the written Word. But this, direct from the throne, is more impressive and commanding than all the voices of nature, of providence, and of the human spirit. Let the preacher interpret these. Let him gather from every department of truth that which will enrich the special province of the pulpit. Let him draw from the recesses of nature, from the treasures of science, from all the works of God, that which will illustrate and enforce the language of revelation. But he has impressive authority only when his voice is the echo of God's voice in the Scriptures; when the light which he pours on the mind is a radiation from the "Father of lights," through the volume of inspiration; when his logic has its basis and proportions in the reasoning indited by the Spirit. He does not hear the voice of God from the burning bush; he is not called to the mount of his terrible majesty to receive his commands; he is not wrapped in the vision of the prophet, nor "caught up to the third heaven," that he may learn what God would have him speak. Inspiration has long since done its specific work. Yet its office is not ended, as the preacher adopts and enforces its teachings. It was a privilege to have a part in the visions and converse of the mount of transfiguration, when that voice came from the excellent glory: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" so that Peter could say: "And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." But that voice still speaks in its original tone. The words of God, repeated by the preacher, still possess their solemn grandeur and divine unction. They are authoritative as ever in their heavenly import, with the seal of the Holy Spirit. Shall he not clothe himself with this authority? Shall he consent to sacrifice this source of power? What can he bring out from the treasures of philosophy, or the inventions of a human intellect, that will

teristics of the preacher's mind will be impressed on his own manner of exhibiting truth. Yet, as he encompasses and pervades his utterances with the divine voice, his preaching will be, substantially, a "Thus saith the Lord." No attributes of the man can compensate for the absence of this. There may be invention and taste, a keen logic and a finished rhetoric; his thoughts may glitter with an earthly light; the lovers of novelty and the worshippers of the beautiful may decree to him the supremacy in the eloquence of the pulpit; but the authority is wanting which belongs to a simple unfolding of the message of God. That is wanting which will satisfy the inquiring mind; for it seeks an answer to its questions which bears the stamp of divine authority. It wants to hear what God speaks.

It is not the air of authority which appears in the style of dogmatism or dictation. It is not that show of it which is derived from the Church, attested by outward signs and symbols—"the robe of costly stuff, flowing fullness and heavy fold." It is not that which one throws around his message, by a frequent, emphatic reference to the name of God, as the source of his commission. This is of little worth, and is often repulsive, when there is nothing else to impress such a fact on the mind. There ought to be that tone of the voice, that look of the eye, that action and style of address, which will convey the idea that he speaks under the deep conviction of a messenger of God. But this element of power must pervade the very texture of the sermon. If not found there, other genuine signs of it will hardly be expected.

The preacher meets men on this foundation—"all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." The power of this fact is great when it is boldly recognized in his manner of preaching. Then his reasoning has a force which silences objection. His argument is rooted in the divine Word; its process is guided by it; the seal of Heaven stamps it. A sound, complete Scriptural argument is a perfect demonstration. Who shall question it? There is a force in truth directly evolved from the Word of God—fortified and inspirited with it in all its amplification, which arrests mind and carries it trium-

phantly to the conclusion. It is something above the eloquence of man and the logic of the schools. The language of Nature is in harmony with the voice of God in the Bible; her ten thousand voices confirm it. Providence speaks in lessons that vividly illustrate it. There is a voice sometimes coming up from the depths of the soul, responsive to that of the written Word. But this, direct from the throne, is more impressive and commanding than all the voices of nature, of providence, and of the human spirit. Let the preacher interpret these. Let him gather from every department of truth that which will enrich the special province of the pulpit. Let him draw from the recesses of nature, from the treasures of science, from all the works of God, that which will illustrate and enforce the language of revelation. But he has impressive authority only when his voice is the echo of God's voice in the Scriptures; when the light which he pours on the mind is a radiation from the "Father of lights," through the volume of inspiration; when his logic has its basis and proportions in the reasoning indited by the Spirit. He does not hear the voice of God from the burning bush; he is not called to the mount of his terrible majesty to receive his commands; he is not wrapped in the vision of the prophet, nor "caught up to the third heaven," that he may learn what God would have him speak. Inspiration has long since done its specific work. Yet its office is not ended, as the preacher adopts and enforces its teachings. It was a privilege to have a part in the visions and converse of the mount of transfiguration, when that voice came from the excellent glory: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" so that Peter could say: "And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." But that voice still speaks in its original tone. The words of God, repeated by the preacher, still possess their solemn grandeur and divine unction. They are authoritative as ever in their heavenly import, with the seal of the Holy Spirit. Shall he not clothe himself with this authority? Shall he consent to sacrifice this source of power? What can he bring out from the treasures of philosophy, or the inventions of a human intellect, that will

be a substitute for it? Must he not become weak, when he forsakes this divine fortress, throws aside the celestial armor, and ventures into the field with weapons forged and burnished by human hands? There may be attraction to some in his elegancies, in his novelties of plan and movement, in his intellectual dodges and side-strokes; but he is weak, because he loses the force of that authority over the intellect and conscience, which is derived from the presence and apt use of Biblical language, argument and illustration.

3. In Biblical preaching, the "harmony of divine truth" is most successfully developed. The sympathy and connection of the various truths of revelation give to them the unity of a perfect system. Consistency in the instructions of the pulpit demands a regard to this law of relations. If it is overlooked, one truth being presented in its separation from the others, as if not yielding support to, nor in any way dependent on them, the preacher is not true to the system, or to the individual truths that compose it. Their relative importance not being regarded, some will be unduly elevated, while others, of equal or superior claims, will be depressed. In this way he may fail to declare the whole gospel as God has given it. This accounts for certain extremes into which men are sometimes led. Perhaps one interprets his commission as assigning him the field of truth embraced in the divine decrees, while another regards the freeness of salvation as his distinct province. There it is the utter helplessness of the sinner, and there it is his ability to obey the commands of God, which is the staple of the pulpit. Perhaps it is accepted by some that doctrinal truths are the total message on which they must spend their strength. They take the trust as if, according to the title which has been given them, they were a "kind of doctrinal aristocracy," and so preach these truths as to sever them from duty and practice. Others there are who enthrone themselves in the empire of ethics, refusing to divide the kingdom with doctrinal truth. With some it is chiefly law with its sanctions; with others it is chiefly love with its blessings. The former, as if walking around the base of the mount that burned with fire, and conversing with its thunders, believe

they can only "make full proof of their ministry" by the constant use of the "terrors of the Lord." The latter, delighting to sit beneath the canopy of mercy, so contract the field of their vision as almost to lose sight of the connection between Christ and the law, and are chiefly occupied in presenting "the gentle images of the Gospel."

While the several parts of the Christian system are not set forth in the Bible, in respect to form and place, as the consecutive articles of a creed, there is one central principle so all-pervading as to bind together all parts of that system. This central principle is the doctrine of Christ. He is "all and in all" in the Bible. If the preacher seizes this truth, as Paul did, he will determine the position of all other truths by their relation to it. Elevated in the pulpit just as it is in the Bible, it will shape and animate all his instructions, and bind into harmony every part of revelation.

This is the preaching that is known by its beautiful consistency. There is no clashing among the parts of God's plan of moral government. No principle asserts its claim so as to obscure another. The place of each being determined by its relation to the central one, all the kindred truths make one whole. How attractive and satisfying is the view of the character of God, when every perfection is put in the light of the doctrine of redemption! Not only does the grace of the Gospel harmonize with these divine attributes, but it makes them appear especially glorious, in all that it accomplishes for sinners. Truth in respect to God and man here folds in with truth. Justice and grace stand side by side at the cross. Sovereign efficiency and human dependence come out clear, indisputable facts, and join in friendly attitude on the platform of the atonement. Here divine rights and human responsibility meet in perfect correspondence; while the reasoning that sustains the rights of God, and the motives that urge the duty of man, derive special force from the sacrifice of Christ. As the law is exhibited with all the consequences of transgression, the refuge of the soul in Christ stands out more impressively from that dark background of sin and woe. Indeed, it is in the light of the cross that we see God, in nature, providence and

legislation, on the throne of justice and grace, carrying out his purposes in perfect consistency. The faithful expositor of the Scriptures will ever find himself in the light of the cross; and all the truths of revelation will open in that light in beautiful harmony.

4. Biblical preaching promotes the intellectual and spiritual power of the preacher. No language like that of the Bible gives to thought its penetrating, awakening power. It can not be retained in any paraphrase of it. Not a few are the passages of Scripture which a preacher has felt it were better to pronounce in their simple, original form, and let them sink into the heart, rather than subject them to the analysis and amplification of a human intellect. There is in them a wealth and a reach of thought, under the influence of which his mind is carried up to the throne of God, and kindled as if in the presence of Jehovah, leading him to intense and delighted study of the "wondrous things." Intellectual expansion is the effect of fellowship with such divine verities. The commentator on Plato has a noble discipline as he accompanies his teacher in the land of shadows, communing with his spirit in its struggles upward toward the light; but the Bible expositor is in the light of the risen sun, and walks with his divine teacher amid the disclosures of truth, of which the philosopher never dreamed. Intellect receives a discipline, a spring, a grasp, tributary to its highest power.

But the spiritual growth of the religious teacher is also promoted. It is true, he may study the letter of the Word as a mere scholar, and reap little spiritual advantage. But when he is employing its lessons to show to sinners the way to heaven, gathering its forces around their hearts, he is in contact with truth in that form and with that aim best fitted to intensify the sympathies of his own heart with Christ. He may be in a certain sense Biblical in his preaching and not spiritual; but who would look for a deep, spiritual tone in his ministrations, if his heart is not in close fellowship with the words of the Spirit? Not merely dealing with the Word in the application of critical tests, but with an eager and devout spirit, he is using one of the best means for the culture of his



religious affections. He is drinking at the fountain whence comes a most select influence for the nourishment of his spiritual life.

Completeness in a minister of Christ demands the blending of the intellectual and the spiritual. The spiritual force—the result of the inwrought power of truth—must take the control of intellect, and adapt it to the practical ends of preaching. This is not an artificial, fanciful experience which comes near to a conceit of a divine inflation—sometimes manifest in the pulpit in a poetical enthusiasm, which, following out in a highly wrought spiritual dialect, seizes the hearers with a rapturous influence. Truth, clearly apprehended and defined by the intellect, is the basis and guide of that spiritual development, which is a real power in the preacher. His power, founded in the inner life thus quickened and nurtured, comes forth in his eye, his tone and action. Truth drops from his lips with “the heat of conviction,” because it has passed through “the fire of his life”—being uttered with the “tone of a conviction that wishes to convince.” Eloquence in the pulpit implies more than a knowledge of the truth and skill in its defense. It is something more than the finished dress which the mind of thorough culture will give to thought. It is the eloquence of a deep sincerity, of the healthy beating of a warm heart, which, by the penetration of truth and the grace of the spirit, has become a fountain of light and life.

The style of the preacher is impressed by that of the Bible, and is marked by that simplicity and vividness in the exhibition of truth which invest it with the power of a present reality. As he comes into sympathy with the story of Joseph and his brethren, which brings tears alike from the child and the old man, on reading it the hundredth time; as he studies with deep emotion the picture of the prodigal son; as he is subdued under the power of the narrative of the cross, and the description of the day of judgment, he learns something of the secret of that style in pulpit discourse which is adapted to awaken and melt the soul. Said an eminent statesman:\*

---

\* Samuel L. Southard, Address on *The Literature of the Bible*.

its allurements are depicted, its admonitions uttered, and its threatenings denounced by them, will indicate to you the source whence they have derived their reasonings and illustrations, whether directly from the fountain of living truth, or the stagnant pools of human commentators. They who have aided their styles and modes of thought by diligent study of this book, if they do not rise to the highest grade of excellence, never sink below it."

We do not exaggerate the power of the preacher who girds himself with truth directly from the Scriptures. It must be mellowing, genial, yet also searching and quickening. He does not study according to a theory, what may be the keynote of an emotion; but he has the artist's skill to touch the cord aright. He does not calculate by rule the rise and fall in the tides of feeling, but moves on the hearts of men through the Word, as the conductor of a divine force. Rules, indeed, are incompetent here. He wants something more than that which he has obtained from books and the didactics of the lecture-room. He must know how to hold the glass so that light shall touch the soul within a focal power; but he must gain this knowledge by keeping his own mind and heart in loving contact with the pure Word. He can not attain the highest degree of strength, except under the direct culture of the Spirit. But who is so likely to enjoy this educating agency for the spiritual man, as the faithful expositor of the Bible? On almost every page he is reminded of the necessity of offering the prayer, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

Who are the men whose names live in the history of the pulpit as the efficient preachers of their times? When has the pulpit accomplished the most, in moulding the common mind, in the propagation of a sound religious faith, in the promotion of a pure morality, and in the conversion of souls? Not when it was "beguiled from the simplicity that is in Christ," by the subtleties of the schoolmen, or by the charm of splendid rites substituted for a spiritual religion. Not when it has made its distinctive excellence to consist in mere intellectual strength and beauty, rather than the richness,

pathos and pungency imparted by the knowledge and experience of the Word of God. Not when it was occupied by the ethics of Christianity, to the neglect of those doctrines to which faith must ever cling as the basis and the life of a sound morality. We ask for the men who have brought into the pulpit the fruits of a reverent and earnest study of the Bible. We ask for those who, instead of magnifying the dignity of man, have so elevated the law of God and the cross of Christ as to humble the sinner in view of his depravity, and exalt the grace of the atonement in his salvation. Such are the men who live in the history of the church from the times of Chrysostom and Augustine to the present. We associate the power and achievements of Luther and Calvin with this type of preaching. The intellectual and spiritual awakenings of the Reformation were the answer to the voice of the Bible as they interpreted it to the people. With their own minds filled with the Word of God, and their hearts kindled by it, they took it as their simple armor in that sublime conflict to carry forward that "insurrection of mind" against error and corruption. Such were some of the men of the seventeenth century. The precious light of that period shines from Biblical pulpits. The fervid eloquence of Baxter came from a soul that was fired in communion with the Bible. This was the source of the rich, mellow, majestic style of John Howe. Leighton gives us the purest gems of sanctified thought, taken out of this divine deposit, and radiant with the light and beauty of the Word. It was the Biblical pulpit, in former days, occupied by her Rutherford, Grey, Boston and McClaurin, that gave spiritual prosperity to the Church of Scotland. The efficiency of the American pulpit in laying the foundations of the church in this land, in extending the borders of our spiritual heritage, in promoting pure revivals of religion, furnishes the strongest testimony to the value of Scriptural preaching, as represented in Edwards, Bellamy, Mason, Griffin, Alexander and Nettleton. The theology which they brought into the pulpit, had the type and the spirit fitted to grasp the common mind and become the theology of the people, because it was Biblical.

This subject has an important relation to the growth and efficiency of the Church. A Biblical pulpit will make a Biblical church—a church distinguished for Biblical piety. The piety that is Scriptural is intelligent, steadfast and reliable; not superficial, sickly and fluctuating. Drawing its life from such a source, it will not only come into sympathy with the designs of the kingdom of Christ, but will act under the power of those motives to duty which centre in the cross, and look to the glory of God. Hence it will be ready for patient, hard work—ready to hold on in sustaining the enterprise of Christian love for saving this lost world. Without the fickleness of mere sentiment and emotion, and with the force of principle, it will be true to the demands of the Master's cause.

The present is a time full of interest in respect to the maintenance and progress of truth. Men no longer entertain "the idea that theology, that religious questions and affairs, are the privileged territory of the clergy." The right of question and debate is claimed and used by all. The creeds of the church are no longer triumphant as guides to the faith of men. There are influences now warping the minds of the people on religious questions which we can not overlook. They entwine themselves in systems of mental philosophy, in educational theories, in the speculations of the scholar, in the popular reading of the day, tending in no small degree to depreciate the authority and claims of the Bible. If our religious teachers aim to make a popular pulpit by that which they can spin and weave with all manner of beautiful colors, without the "warp and woof" of Scriptural thought, the result will be that a vast amount of mind will "swing from its moorings" by the rock of truth. If the ministry is qualified to do the work of this day, it must be one that magnifies the Word of God, that is deeply imbued with its spirit, and has all its resources baptized with waters from this fountain. It must use the sword of the Spirit, and this only; and must know how to wield it with a holy dexterity. We want no sentimental pulpit, artistically nice in every tone and movement, as if seeking admiration and patronage. We want a ministry educated in all the wisdom of the Scriptures, at the

feet of Jesus; stalwart men, by reason of the truth that lives in them and feeds their strength. Give us a perfect organization for every benevolent mission of the church; give us liberal endowments for our theological schools; give us church edifices that shall attract the people to the worship of God in all our wide territory; but give us, especially, a Biblical Ministry, who shall preach with the unction of the Spirit and the Word, with clear and pungent reasoning out of the Scriptures, with the eloquence of the Cross.

---

#### ART. IV.—PRESIDENT WHELOCK AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

By Rev. E. H. GILLET, D. D., New York.

It is doubtful whether any two men can be mentioned, whose manuscript remains—for the most part hitherto unpublished—can be rendered more serviceable in throwing light upon the social, religious and civil history of New England, than President Wheelock and President Stiles. The life of each has been written, but with a meagre use of the abundant materials at command, and the result has been an individual portrait, rather than a vivid picture of the men and the events of their time. Indeed, the manuscript remains of both these men are so voluminous—that of Pres. Stiles embracing more than 40 manuscript quarto volumes, and those of Pres. Wheelock to be measured by the cubic foot—that the task of arranging and sifting them with a view to the publication of the results might well seem appalling. The biographers of Wheelock, especially, seem to have been content with giving a mere outline of his career, and surrendered his manuscript treasures to an almost unqualified neglect.

It would require volumes to do them adequate justice, but some portions of his journals and correspondence seem to us too valuable to be left longer to slumber unread and unknown. His position, character and relations were such as to make his letters very largely a reflection of the religious thought, and a record of the events, of his time, while the men with whom he

was more or less directly associated, are men, many of them with whom we desire a more intimate acquaintance than is afforded by the memorials of them which history has preserved.

President Wheelock was himself a remarkable man. He was one of the leading spirits of the "Great Revival" of the last century. He labored extensively as an itinerant. He corresponded with a great number of distinguished men on both sides of the ocean. In the cause of Indian Missions, his labors rank him with the apostolic Eliot. As the founder of Moore's Charity School, and subsequently of Dartmouth College, he appears before the world as a man of great energy, remarkable executive talent, and a large Christian faith. The wonderful experience of Müller's *Life of Trust* is anticipated in the unostentatious record of his career—a record so long buried from the world, and which now, after the lapse of a full century, comes before us in his own simple narratives, with a remarkable freshness and charm.

Eleazar Wheelock was born at Windham, Ct., April 22, 1711, old style. His earliest ancestor of whom we have any account, was his great-grandfather, Ralph Wheelock, born in Shropshire, Eng., in 1600, and educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge. As a sufferer for his non-conformity to the ceremonies of the English Church, under the domination of Laud, he fled to this country in 1637. In the following year, he was one of the founders of the church of Dedham, Mass., though not its pastor. Removing thence to Medfield, he became one of the principal proprietors. Without being settled as pastor, he preached at Medfield and other places, and, for several years during the period from 1653 to 1667, he was a representative in the General Court. His death occurred in 1683, and his descendants are numerous in Eastern Massachusetts.

The fourth son of Rev. Ralph Wheelock, born at Medfield in 1654, was Capt. Eleazar Wheelock. He early removed to Mendon. In the Indian wars he had command of a company of cavalry, and his house was sometimes converted into a fort for the safety of the settlers. To the savage foe his name was a terror, although in peace he is said to have treated the Indians with great kindness, and sometimes to have joined them



in their hunting excursions. He died, March 24, 1731, aged 77 years.

His son, Ralph Wheelock, was born in 1679 or 1680, probably in Mendon, and was one of the early settlers of Windham, Conn. The church—of which he was ordained deacon in 1729—was formed in 1700, and he remained in connection with it till his death, Oct. 15, 1748. His first wife, whom he married Jan. 8, 1707, was Ruth Huntington, of Norwich. Their second child, and first son, was Eleazar. After the death of his mother, his father (Sep. 30, 1726) married Mercy Standish, of Preston, a descendant of the celebrated Miles Standish. The only daughter, by this marriage, was the mother of Jerusha Bingham, who became the wife of the Rev. Samuel Kirkland, the father of President Kirkland of Harvard College.

At the age of sixteen or seventeen, there is reason to believe that his heart was renewed by the Spirit of God. He immediately commenced his studies, preparatory to college, a legacy having been left him by his grandfather, whose name he bore, to defray the expenses of his education. Good conduct and proficiency in learning secured him a favorable standing as a scholar.

In 1733, Wheelock completed his course at Yale College. Among those with whom he must then have become acquainted, are quite a number with whom he subsequently corresponded. When he entered as Freshman, the celebrated Timothy Allen was a Senior, Joseph Bellamy and Aaron Burr were Juniors, while Abel Stiles, uncle of President Stiles, Benajah Case, and Benjamin Pomeroy, were class-mates. Daniel Humphreys, the famous James Davenport, Nehemiah Brainerd, Jonathan Todd, Timothy Woodbridge, and Ebenezer Devotion, were in the class below him, while Jonathan Ashley, of Deerfield, Jonathan Barber, associated with Whitefield, Moses Bartlett, and Andrew Bartholomew, must have become connected with the College before he left it.

Of Wheelock's favorite studies we may derive some hints from a letter addressed to him January 8, 1734, a few months after his graduation, and while he continued to reside at New

Haven. The writer is his class-mate, Abel Stiles, and he dates his letter from Lebanon, Ct.

"Professor Mathematicæ ad modum venerande, alias Neighbor Wheelock:

If you do not send me a letter before you are many days older I shall think you worse than an infidel. I would entreat you to lay by your Newton, your Wiston and your Euclid, and let your scale and dividers be useless awhile; so long, at least, as to write a line to me. To what purpose is it to keep your mind everlastingly wrapped up in the contemplation of Saturn with his cohort of Satellites, and the Via Lactea with her multiplicity of stars invisible. In short, you have forgot that you belong to that inferior planet called Terra; you have taken your flight hence, and are seeking a freehold among constellations.

But, hoping you would visit this globe again, I presumed to send this letter, intending it should remain in the place where you were wont to reside. With due regard, I am, in haste, your humble servant,  
A. STILES."

The superscription of the letter is "For Mr. Eleazar Wheelock, Student in Yale College, in New Haven." From this, as well as from other intimations, we are led to believe that, as a resident graduate, he continued his studies, devoting a portion of his time to theological pursuits, under the supervision of Rector Williams.

In 1735, Wheelock accepted a call to the North Society in Lebanon, known at that time as Lebanon Crank, now Columbia. His ministerial neighbors were Solomon Williams at Lebanon First Society, Jared Elliot at Goshen Society, Ephraim Little at Colchester, Thomas Clap, subsequently Rector of Yale College, at Windham, Joseph Meacham at Coventry, while Hebron was in confusion, without a pastor.

Previous to the commencement of the great revival in 1739-40, Rev. Stephen Williams, of Longmeadow, was one of Wheelock's most frequent correspondents. Though the former was many years his senior, the two men had married sisters, daughters of Rev. John Davenport, of Stamford, and sisters of the Rev. James Davenport, so famous for his enthusiastic excesses during the time of revival. A sister of Wheelock was married to Benjamin Pomeroy, his class-mate, who was settled at Hebron some few months after he had himself been settled at Lebanon, and thus were these two men of kindred spirit closely and permanently associated together.

Wheelock's earliest letters refer to Hebron. He writes to Stephen Williams, December 1, 1735:

"Hebron is in the utmost confusion. I can't tell you half how bad they are. The day appointed for Mr. Pomeroy's ordination is next Wednesday, come fortnight, and whether he will be ordained or no is something doubtful. It looks almost like the going into the mouth of hell."

A few months later he writes again, August 26, 1736:

"It is somewhat probable they will settle Mr. Pomeroy at Hebron, and 'tis something probable, if they don't, Mr. Bliss's party will declare for Episcopacy."

At the same date he discusses the expediency of the ordination of John Sergeant as missionary to the Stockbridge Indians. It is curious to find the conservative Stephen Williams favoring it, and Wheelock, who subsequently verged so strongly to the lax ecclesiasticism of the revival, calling its wisdom in question. He doubts whether it can be justified on Scripture grounds, and believes no precedent can be found for it in Apostolic usage.

Another letter of Wheelock, bearing date August 18, 1737, reminds us that his childhood was less than a generation removed from the great witchcraft delusion of Salem. He writes to Stephen Williams:—

"It is common talk at Windham, that old Goody Fullsom (the woman that Mr. Clap had so much difficulty in the church about, and at last excommunicated) is a witch; and, indeed, there are many stories which Mr. Clap has told me of her that looks very dark. . . . Mr. Clap told me yesterday, that on last Sabbath there came in an ill-looking dog into the room where Mrs. Abbie was sick, and her brother that was there took up a broom-staff and gave it a blow as hard as he could strike. The dog went away very lame, and the very instant, as near as they could come at it, the old woman, being at meeting at Scotland, roared out in the meeting house with a pain in her shoulder, and when Sheriff Huntington, the bone-setter, came to feel of it the next day, he found the bones much broken, insomuch that he could hear them rattle in the skin. But I would not weary out your patience."

But with the commencement of the great revival, the letters of Wheelock are of a different tone. He threw himself into it with his whole heart. It is doubtful whether even Bellamy exceeded him in activity or energy, or was so universally welcomed in other and distant localities. With an unquestionable piety, and a facility of extempore utterance, he combined other and peculiar advantages. He had a large measure of what might be called tact, nor was he too proud, upon conviction, to confess his mistakes, and improve by his own errors and the suggestions of others. As a speaker, he must have

been, in his early years at least, unusually attractive. Trumbull says, he was "a gentleman of a comely figure, of a mild and winning aspect, his voice smooth and harmonious, the best, by far, that I ever heard. He had the entire command of it. His gesture was natural but not redundant. His preaching and addresses were close and pungent, and yet winning beyond almost all comparison, so that his audience would be melted even into tears before they were aware of it."

We find no marked manifestation of religious revival in Wheelock's congregation till toward the close of 1739. The work had already been going forward for some time in Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, and Whitefield had been laboring in the same field, as also in New York, but in the latter place with only moderate success. At different places in New England, more than usual religious interest had been manifested, although the general state of the churches was lamentably worldly. But, on January 3, 1740, Wheelock writes to Stephen Williams:

"There is an evident revival of religion among my people. There has been more appearance of conviction and conversion work here within these six weeks than there has before in three years, put all together; and one very remarkable instance of the death-bed conversion of a young woman, the account of which is now too long to write."

From this date the work of revival began to spread widely in all directions. It was very powerful at Southold, under the ministry of James Davenport, the brother-in-law both of Williams and Wheelock. To the latter Williams writes (March 16, 1740):

"I want to hear from Long Island. I lately heard that a New York man that came from the Island (said) that they were got distracted again at Southold about religion. By this I would hope religion has got a revival. . . . A great concern at Deerfield."

Wheelock, more deeply interested than Williams, determined to visit Davenport at Southold, and in April or May executed his purpose. On his return he writes to Williams (May 22, 1740):

"The report that you have had that he (Davenport) is delirious, I believe is not true. I was with him almost a fortnight and perceived nothing of it. I heard him preach an *extempore* sermon 2½ hours long. There were several ministers present. I did not hear them observe any mark of distraction, nor did I

take notice of any myself, unless it were the length of the sermon, and the fervour and vehemence with which he delivered it. The matter that he delivered I tho't to be, in the main, good sense. He told the people he should be glad to die in the desk, if by that means their souls might be blessed. Mr. Pomeroy and I advised him to ride, and he went with us to New York, where we saw and heard and conversed with the Rev. Mr. Whitefield and there I left my Br. D., designing for the Jerseys to see Mr. Tennent, and then designed to return to Stamford and then home. There are many reports about him and Mr. Barber which have no truth in them. Others there are which have some foundations, but much misrepresented. I don't know that I have heard one story, upon the main, (except from a Long Island man before I went) that has been represented in any measure right. . . . I believe that Mr. Dickinson of Elizabethtown, and Mr. Pemberton of New York, have as just and clear an understanding of the case as any that have been personally acquainted with brother."

Wheelock closes his letter with the wish that he and his correspondent may have more of what the world calls enthusiasm and distraction. In a letter of two weeks later date, (June 6, 1740,) he says, recurring to their common relative:

"Br. Davenport of the Island was much out of health when I left him. The extraordinary impressions he has had upon his mind has sometimes almost took away his life. He has sometimes been so weak that he could scarce go alone, and his discourse and his preaching has been in a way somewhat proportionable to it. . . . I left him at New York, designing for the Jerseys."

Wheelock's defense of what "the world calls enthusiasm and distraction," did not exactly suit the taste of his more conservative and cautious correspondent, and it seems to have brought back an answer which Wheelock regarded as a criticism on his own course. To this he replies (June 9, 1740):

"You speak concerning intemperate zeal. I acknowledge there is such a thing as being over zealous, and carried on with too much fierceness and eagerness. But let me tell you with all humility that I think your zeal is generally intemperate; by yours I mean not only yours, but the common zeal of the country is very intemperate, and that in regard of its coldness. It is so cold that it does little or no good. I think that a zeal of God that arises from a work of God's Spirit and grace in the heart, from divine light and teaching, though it may be overheated, and carrying men on with too much eagerness and engagedness for a while, is vastly less hurtful to religion and less dangerous than yours that moves you to do nothing upon any occasion out of your old path. I think that the zeal that many cry out of as intemperate is in a much better temper than their cold zeal is who cry out of it. Yea, I believe there is vastly less hurt by some degrees of enthusiasm, where there is a fervent love to God and souls, than there is by the lukewarmness and coldness that does so generally obtain among ministers. If God's remarkable owning such men and such zeal be an evidence of it, then it is so. Witness Br. Daven-

port's extraordinary success since his intemperate zeal; also the success of the Tennents and others in the Jerseys, not to speak of Mr. Whitefield, etc."

But Wheelock's correspondent was not prepared to assent to all these views. In a letter of July 18, 1740, he remarks, "it is a small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's judgment," but declining to enter into any controversy, that shall look like censuring, blaming, or tending to exasperate, he sets forth very concisely his views of Christian experience, and closes with the following queries:

"1. Whether when the affection of Christians and ministers are lively and vigorous they are not in some special danger. 2. Whether rapturous joys are so good an evidence of grace as humility and lowly mindedness. 3. Whether we need not be very careful as to our pronouncing the state of others good or bad. 4. Whether it is a fault in those who are concerned for the welfare of Zion, and that tremble for the ark of God, to be afraid that the zeal of God's own children may hurt Christ's kingdom. 5. Whether we haven't reason to hope that there is the truth and sincerity of grace in many humble Christians that think meanly of themselves, and dare not venture to show themselves forward, etc. 6. Whether the wisdom of God is not very obvious in the different tempers and gifts of his children, etc. 7. Whether Christians and ministers are not too ready to make their own experience the rule for others. 8. Whether this *abundance of revelations* (or in receiving favors from God not common to others) we are not in danger of being exalted above, etc. 9. Whether there is not like much hurt to accrue to the interest of real religion by blasting the reputation of those ministers that are of sound principles, of good lives and conversations, tho' they have not been favored with that light, etc., that some have had. 10. Whether we must certainly conclude that those ministers are cold and lukewarm (or that they don't go out of their old paths) to whom God does not grant remarkable success."

Davenport himself, who had not yet attained to that height of enthusiastic extravagance for which he subsequently became so notorious, next appears as Wheelock's correspondent. His letter is as follows:—

"SOUTHOLD, Oct. 5, 1740.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER: I thank you for yours, and rejoice to hear of the revival of religion with you, and of some conversions. May the Lord proceed and grant abundant effusions of his Spirit upon your place and others. The concern among us I fear is much abated. O, join in earnest prayer, though at a distance, that the Lord would revive his own work. I have had lately bodily weakness and indisposition, and not preached for four or five Sabbaths before this day. I have had some refreshing seasons for a little while, but most of the time for two or three months I have been much exercised with inward trials—been led more into myself than ever—never before knew so much what desertion meant. After such light and success there was need of a thorn, etc. The Lord is infinitely wise and good—has been humbling and purifying of me,



fitting me to deal with some souls. I would leave my soul wholly with him, and live by faith on him. Let him do with me as seemeth him good. He allows me at present some taste of his goodness. This I would be thankful for, but not live upon the streams. This day I was able to preach, and this afternoon the Lord opened my mouth so that I scarcely knew how to shut it, till some were wrought upon, wounded at least. I hope the Lord granted some effect. I would hope (I can't but long) that the Lord would visit us again with his salvation.

As I am somewhat particular in the account of God's dealing with me, though I can but hint at some things, I trust you will be as particular in your secret addresses to the Lord on my account, and I should be glad to know more of your state, as you may think proper.

O my dear Brother, let us through grace be faithful to our glorious Master, and to the souls committed to our charge. Tho' the difficulties of the work are great (the thought of them has sometimes in this late season almost overwhelmed me; the Lord forgive my unbelief), yet the grace of God is sufficient to carry us through all. O let us be faithful to the death and we shall receive a crown of life.

Your dear Friend and Brother,

DAVENPORT."

In the midst of his revival labors, which at the solicitation of even distant towns were soon to become quite extended, his attention was called to the system of church government which he had introduced, or at least favored, among his own people. It had occasioned some dissatisfaction, on the plea that it allowed the church less freedom of action than was enjoyed elsewhere. To this matter he refers in the following letter, the opening lines of which seem to intimate at once his trials and his comforts. It is without direction, but from its allusions we infer that it was addressed to Solomon Williams:

"REV'D AND HON'D SIR:

How great is the privilege of having God our hiding place when trouble comes, and when men take counsel together against us; or, rather, against Christ, and are making themselves stronger and stronger, then to have a God and Father to commit our cause to, and have peace and quiet within ourselves. I think, through grace, I have known the benefit and comfort of it in some measure. Then I have courage. I fear none of the devices of the crafty. I have a calm within, though they make a storm without. I can love them while they hate me, and bless them while they curse me, and earnestly pray and long for their conversion and salvation. . . .

I rejoice that there is a day of judgment coming when all things shall be set right, and truth will appear in such a light that none can darken it, and we shall see who is in the right and who in the wrong; and, sometimes, I have longed to see my Redeemer coming. The thought of it has made my heart glad. But, alas, at another time the case is altered with me. I am like Samson without his hair. My courage fails; my heart sinks. I seem to be alone because

he is gone. I feel weak. Enemies and opposition look great and terrible. My breast is disquieted, all things seem out of joint till I find my resting and hiding place again, and then I bless the Lord for the troubles that draw me there. But this is not what I designed to write when I sat down.

I have often observed, when there seems to be any revival of religion, and things begin to appear with a better face, there is something hatched to knock it all in the head. This is now the case with my people. There are some that have of late expressed much uneasiness and dissatisfaction with our form of Church Government, *viz.*, by a Church Council. They say it is not like yours. The Council have more authority than yours have, etc., and they have taken much pains to make a party, and have made a considerable one, and some of your people, and such, too, (as I am informed) as we might expect better from, have contributed not a little to it. When I tell them that we are, as to the substance, the same with yours, and prove it to them from your practices in such instances as I have been knowing to, yet they won't believe me, because Captain Marsh and Justice Woodward and others (who know your Constitution) assert that it is not so. I will therefore give you the copy of the Church vote, and some account of my practice upon it.

At a meeting of the Brethren of the Church of Christ in Lebanon, North Parish. The Church then voted that they would chuse a competent number of the most judicious, prudent and skillful of the Brethren of the church, and set them apart for, and commit to them the management of all affairs in the church government, in all ordinary cases, and appoint them to examine, try and judge of the same in their name and behalf, under the conduct of their minister or pastor, and to advise, assist and help him in any matters wherein he shall desire or require their help and assistance.

Pursuant to the vote, the Church made choice of these brethren, in the order following: Deacon John Newcomb, Deacon Joseph Clark, etc.

My practice is to call the Committee together and cite the offenders and evidences to appear. When met, we hear the evidences and the offender's pleas; and when we have got all the light we can, we are in private, and there make up a judgment. If he is convicted, and refuses to comply with it, after a suitable time waiting upon him, and he remaining obstinate, before a further proceeding, I propose to lay it before the Church and take their concurrence (though we have never had such an instance yet). In the case of Ez. Fuller, the Church Council were unanimous in it that he ought to be admonished publicly, and he consented to submit to it. Notwithstanding, I tho't it proper to take the vote of the Church upon it, and did take their vote for it, before I proceeded. Now, if our Constitution and my practice agrees, in the main, and without any essential difference, with yours, I wish you would signify it to me in writing. And, also, I desire you would pray those gentlemen of your Councils, in my name, (unless you think of some better way) not to meddle so much with my affairs, and the affairs of the church here, till they know more about them, or can meddle with more prudence. I charitably believe they don't know what mischief they do. I don't justly know what they have said in the case, but so much I believe they have said, as has encouraged the opposite party in their unreasonable opposition and increased their dissatisfaction. I ask your pardon for hindering you so long. Yours,

LEB., Nov. 7, 1740.

ELEAZAR WHEELOCK.

This letter gives us valuable information concerning the method of church government approved by Wheelock, and practiced undoubtedly, not only by him, but by many others. It will be seen that without the name it substantially adopts the principle of a Presbyterian Session.

Whether, as Wheelock's letter seems to intimate, ecclesiastical questions gave occasion for a check to religious progress among his people, or other causes were at work, the force of the revival seemed quite spent by the autumn of 1740. His neighbor, Solomon Williams, pastor of the First Church in Lebanon, writes to him (October 25, 1740), proposing, in behalf of their common neighbor, Eliot (of Goshen Society) and himself, that the three pastors in the same town, in view of "the awful sickness which God in his holy providence has sent into the three Societies," and "the unawakened carnal spirit which our people are generally under, and the dead sleep which they are in, notwithstanding the awakening and terrible judgments of a holy God, . . . should spend some time together in prayer to God, without letting any other persons be acquainted with it." "We proposed," he says, "to spend next Wednesday at my study, as much of the time as could be spared from your coming and return, and then, on some other times we should agree upon, at his house, and at yours. If the proposal suits you, I pray you would let me know on Monday, that I may inform him, or if you like the thing, and choose some other day, . . . send."

Ere long the work of revival commences anew in Wheelock's parish, and, as we shall see, is powerful in other parts around him. His zeal and acceptableness as a preacher make him welcome wherever friends of the revival are to be found, and he is earnestly sought for, far and near. One of his trips, performed in the fall or winter of 1740-1, takes him northward, to Hartford, Windsor, and probably Longmeadow, and Enfield, if not Northampton. Delayed on his return, at Windsor, he writes to his people from that place:

*"To the Church and People of God in Lebanon North Parish.*

DEARLY BELOVED:

I came here to Winsor yesterday with a design to come to you this day. The Lord bowed the heavens and came down upon the assembly the last night. The

people seemed to be filled with his great power, a very great number crying out under a sense of the wrath of God and the weight of their guilt; 13 or 14, we believe, converted. My dear brother Pomeroy came to me this morning from Mr. Marsh's\* parish, where the work was also great the last night. We were just setting out to come home, but a number of people were met together, and the distress among them soon arose to such a height that we think we have a call of Providence to continue here over the Sabbath. Several have been converted already this morning. There is now work enough for ten ministers in this town. There is a very glorious work at Suffield, and it has been very marvellous. In a great assembly at Enfield 10 or 12 converted there. Much of his power was seen at Long Meadow on Thursday, 6 or 7 converted there, and a great number wounded. There was considerable seen at Springfield, old town, on Thursday night, and much of it again yesterday morning at Long Meadow. People every where throng together to hear the word, and I do verily believe these are the beginning of the glorious things that are spoken concerning the City of our God in the latter day. I am much concerned for some that remain yet stupid and blind among my dear flock. I desire your continual remembrance of me, your poor pastor, in your prayers to God, that I may be strengthened in the inward and outward man to all that the Lord shall call me to. I hope to be with you at the beginning of next week.

I am your souls' friend and servant for Christ,

ELEAZAR WHEELOCK."

The tone of this letter to his people is indicative of the pastor's zeal. But reproach as well as praise attended him. Not a few accounted him an enthusiast, while his friends felt for him a peculiar attachment, as one that, while abundant in labors, was willing to endure shame for the Master's sake. The following letter from Capt. John Lee, of Lyme—who seems from later letters to have been a man of some civil as well as military prominence—and which reflects very distinctly that popular feeling which in some quarters was soon to bear fruit in *Separatism*, is valuable as affording us a view of his own pastor, Jonathan Parsons, afterward of Newburyport, as well as of Tennent and Whitefield. It is dated, Lyme, December 5, 1740:

"DEAR SIR:—Take it not amiss that one to you almost unknown takes the boldness to trouble you with a few lines. I have heard of you by the hearing of the ear; yea, I have heard of the defaming of many; you are not unacquainted that you, for Christ's sake, have been counted an enthusiast, mad man and dunce; but let not these things move you, for they that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution. It amazes me to hear how many of the great doctors and letter learned teachers of this day, talk as ignorantly of the new birth, as their great patron Nicodemus did, some making it consist in noth-

---

\* Jonathan Marsh, one of the ministers in Windsor.

ing more than being a moralist. I am much surprised to see that among our own teachers that profess to be Calvinists, yet seem to stand mute when any thing is said about inward feelings and of being led by the Spirit, etc., they seem hardly to understand the meaning of such words and phrases, and among those few that is left in our Israel that have not bowed the knee to Baal, the idol of salvation by the law, Oh how few is there that, like Elijah, durst be bold for God, and say to, and of, the great doctors of this age, 'tis you that trouble our Israel: but the most are preaching smooth things, sewing pillows, daubing with untempered mortar, and heal the daughter of my people slightly. But God hath not left himself without a witness; in almost every place, some faithful sons of the prophets he strengthens with zeal and courage to tell to Jacob their sin, and to Israel their transgressions, though 'tis true we have generally a name to live. But alas! I would to God that we're not all that, in a general way, can be said of most; what a sad condition must a people be in, when the prophets prophesy lies, and the priest bare rule by these means, and the people love to have it so. Then how easily and pleasantly do the blind lead the blind till they all fall into the ditch of everlasting torments together. But when God stirs up any to stand in the way and tell both priests and people their danger, and the dreadful ends of such blind guides and their followers, how will the devil and blind priests, his prime ministers, rage and roar; they'll represent such men as the turners of the world upside down, common mischief-makers, men not fit to live. They will follow them with the most base calumnies, load them with the vilest reproaches, dress them in the skins of the most hateful animals, in order to set the populace on them as so many hell-hounds, to devour them. But God, who will carry on his own work against all opposition, whenever he pleases, turns all these councils into foolishness, brings paleness upon all faces, stops, confounds, yea, converts the most virulent and hardy opposers whenever he pleases; he puts such courage into his dear children, that like the meek man Moses, they care not for Pharaoh and all his magicians; nor a David, be dismayed at the huge, bulky stature of a fierce and domineering Goliath; nor an Elijah, regard the violent threatening of an Ahab and Jezebel. He can send forth a John Baptist to preach and to pronounce woes against the most potent and most conceited self-righteous Pharisee: a dozen poor illiterate fishermen can subdue kingdoms, not with carnal weapons, but with the pure word of God, preached in a spirit of meekness, and dare be bold for God; they feared not the faces of the great. The king of terrors was no terror to them. So when God called Luther, a poor friar, out of his cell, to bear witness for his name, and to bring many sons to glory, all the power of Rome and Hell can't dismay him. And in our times, may we not say that God hath raised up some men as burning and shining lights, to restore the church to the purity that she possessed at the dawn of the Reformation. But how are such precious sons of Zion (comparable to fine gold) set at nought; but of all that God hath stirred up, that fell under our view, the most to be admired is the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, a valiant young David, that fears not the foes of all the uncircumcised Goliaths. How does God direct the stone (which he hurls at such) into their foreheads; they fall down to their own confusion. I have had the happiness (God be praised) to hear this son of thunder preach seven times, and have been greatly imprest thereby, more especially by a sermon on the words of our Saviour: 'Except your righteousness exceeds the righteousness

of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven? It was a most awakening sermon to formal professors and self-righteous pharisees, and God hath not left himself without a witness amongst us. We have in this town three faithful ministers, but what is remarkable is, Mr. P., who, when first settled, was a strong, yea, a furious Arminian in principle, but for about two or three years hath been humbled and brought to Christ's foot, and made, experimentally, to see that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified, he having had opportunity to see and converse with Mr. Whitefield, his spirit seems to be knit to his like the spirit of Jonathan to David; his preaching and common conversation is much altered. He is now a son of thunder, breaking the peace and disturbing the carnal security of formal professors. This, I see, brings an odium upon him in the opinion of some of his self-righteous hearers and carnal brethren and acquaintances; but surely he, in the eyes of his Master, is most precious. I lately had the opportunity to hear him—three sermons—more awakening, heart-searching sermons I never heard (except Mr. W—f—d's); his zeal, fervency and great concern for souls makes some ready to call him a hot zealot, a mad fellow, etc. And so it will be with all such as dare be so bold as to break the peace of the carnally secure. I have often thought that ministers who ordinarily do but little good, with light without heat, like the moon, they may give us some faint rays of light, but no heat. The people, generally speaking, don't so much want to be taught to know as be made willing to do their duty; then that minister that can make his way to the hearts and move the passions of his hearers, will, in this country, do the most good. Surely the Creator did not furnish men with passions for nothing. No! surely they are to be wrought upon by setting before them that every moment they are in an unconverted condition they hang over hell by the thread of life, which they are every moment provoking God by their sins (especially of unbelief) to cut asunder. Who knows but they may then cry in good earnest, what must we do to be saved; and then to set before them the death and sufferings of Christ, his active and passive obedience as the only mean of security against the danger they are in, and that by which they may obtain heaven, and so make both fear and hope subservient to the stirring men up to flee from the wrath to come. This week hath been at N. London Mr. Gilbert Tennant, and preached two sermons. I have had this day opportunity to converse with some of the most serious and intelligible persons that heard him, and they say never man spake like him; but the church party rage and roar like so many furies just broke loose.

They call him Romish priest, and his sermons hell-fire sermons, and say all manner of evil falsely of him—a great deceiver, etc. I happened to hear one Patty Pigmire belching out his venom against him. I asked him wherein he was to blame. He told me he preached false doctrine. In what particular, said I. Why, he said, he could not tell—he did not hear him; but he was told he said in his sermon that man's good works was not that for which God would justify him; and, if so, then the consequence was, said he, to open a door to all licentiousness; but, for his part, he would hear no such deceiver; and, indeed, he cast about fire brands, arrows and death like a mad man, and in that condition I left him. I would to God he was the only one that thus please the father of lies by defaming the worthy servants of Jesus Christ.

Now, sir, you may be sure (that is, if you are singularly good) to meet with



scoffers. Expect to meet with persecution and trials of cruel mocking, but let none of these things move you, but go on to conquer. I pray God that hell may tremble before you, and all the powers of darkness be shaken. You wrestle not with flesh and blood only, but with the rulers of darkness, etc. I intend to wait upon you as soon as business will permit.

I am your sincere friend and hearty well-wisher, etc.

DEC. 5, 1740."

The state of things at Lyme is but a fair sample of what was occurring in scores of other places, and Capt. Lee was no unfit representative of multitudes ere long to be ranked as Separatists. The winter and spring of 1740-1 abounds in reports of revivals. Reuben Ely, of Springfield, writes to Wheelock, March 4, 1741, very much in the tone of his East Lyme correspondent, and full of dissatisfaction with his pastor, the Rev. Mr. Breck.

"I have been considerably engaged in striving to promote religion, but not half enough: though some say I am mad, and almost all say I am too much engaged. I have had great opposition from strict moralists of whom every one speaks well, and some from weak Christians, but more from our minister. The openly profane are outrageous, and can't bear me amongst them. They would fain put me to silence. But they can't, neither by rage, nor reason, as they call it. . . . I long to have Christians more engaged. It seems as though they were fast asleep, and the Devil had enclosed them, and buried them, as it were, in a drift of snow, and they are afraid so much as to peep out, and let the world know they are on Christ's side. . . . There are many under awakenings at Longmeadow, two or three I hope converted. . . . Mr. Williams is much enlivened, and preaches Christ in good earnest. O that all our ministers would. A lukewarm minister makes a people so."

From Lyme (West Parish), the pastor, Jonathan Parsons, ere long to assume a more conspicuous position in his settlement at Newburyport, writes to Wheelock, April 21, 1741:

"I have seen more of the power of divine impressions in six days past, than ever I saw in all my life before. The East Society of this town, where Mr. Griswold is pastor, have the caul of their hearts rent asunder, many of them, and the rock is smitten to purpose. They fly to Jesus Christ as a cloud, and as the doves to the windows. Last Wednesday evening, I happened to be at a lecture appointed at my dear brother John Lee's, which was attended by two rooms pretty full of hearers. The preacher I tho't had some enlargement, and without doubt God was with the word for good. The labors of the night were blessed to the conviction of many. Not unto us, but unto thy name, be praise, O God! I suppose the whole assembly (a few excepted) were in tears; five or six were so overcome as to faint under the load of guilt, and sense of divine wrath. About forty were forced to cry out in the agonies of their soul. I never had then seen any thing that (as I tho't) so much resembled the judgment of the great day. It seemed as though the poor creatures had heard the sentence of

the great Judge passed against them, and they found themselves going to execution, tho' two or three received light that evening who before had sought Jesus sorrowing. Last Sabbath, 'tis said, the prospect was more glorious than that before; that the crowded auditory were mostly drowned in tears; and tears have been their meat and drink of abundance, ever since; tho' from tears of deepest anguish, some have emerged into light and joy, ravished with the love of Christ; and can't be content that any among them should refuse divine grace and offered salvation.

My dear Brother, 'tis a cloudy and dark day with me: I find my affections dried up, and that I am easily surprised and overcome: I have reason to walk softly. Pray for me and for my dear flock, that the Spirit may be poured out upon us, and that I might have light, and be led into the sure evidence of my state. I desire the prayers of all God's people in his house, that God enlarge my heart after him and his King'dom, and give me success. I am, in haste,

Your Brother and Servant,

JONATHAN PARSONS."

Almost at the same date, April 15, Stephen Williams writes from Longmeadow:

"There is a greater tho'fulness than usual among us, and some are asking with concern what shall we do to be saved, etc. But I can't speak of such great and wonderful things as we hear of in other places. I have large accounts of the Lord's doings in one place and another, but I have not time or strength to give extracts of my letters from one quarter and another. But I do hope God is about some great and glorious work in the land, and that the time to favor Zion is coming on. I know there are *many adversaries*, but yet I fear religion may receive some wounds in the house of her friends. Mr. Flavell's discourse of ministerial prudence and fidelity, well deserves our serious perusal in the present day."

A report of the state of things in East Lyme comes from Capt. John Lee, under date of May 7, 1741:

"DEAR BROTHER: We greatly expected you and longed for your coming to us yesterday. Blessed be God, the work of the Lord goes on most marvellously. It hath greatly increased since I wrote to you. I never longed to see you so much as now; I want to impart to you my joy and my grief. Every day is a Sabbath, much more than the first day used to be. Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings our good God hath ordained praise. I suppose that above twenty persons are now savingly converted, and are now rejoicing with joy unspeakable. Dear Brother, I intend, Monday come sennet, [seven nights,] to be at Brother Pumroy's, at Hebron, and lodge there that evening. Dear Sir, let me see you there if possible. I long for your conversation. In the mean time, pray for Zion. If you have opportunity, let Brother Pumroy know that I shall be there at the time. Your Brother,

JOHN LEE.

P. S. One of my own children is now rejoicing in God, with such joy as the stranger knows not."

The Rev. Mr. Pomeroy was scarcely less abundant in labors than Wheelock. At Hartford he followed him in his tour, as

is evident from the following letter addressed to Wheelock by Seth Young of Hartford, bearing date, May 22, 1741 :

"Hearing of the wonderful work God is still carrying on amongst you, I can not but write a line or two to you to let you know my heart is with you. . . . I beg your prayers to be continued for this poor distressed town, that God would bring to nought the counsel and device of wicked men. . . . I hope you will come up amongst us again in a little time. We have room enough for you to preach. Our meeting-house is as large as the heavens. I shall not give you a particular account of things here, because the dear Mr. Pomeroy is here, and will be able to do it fully. I hear blessed news from Long Island. God is discovering rotten-hearted hypocrites to the world. Pray don't be discouraged coming amongst us. There is two souls, I have reason to hope, added to Christ by your preaching at our house that evening. . . . The day you went away from Hartford my beloved wife received considerable satisfaction, and it has been renewed since. . . . We had a wonderful meeting at our house on Wednesday night. The spirit of God seemed present, many crying out. . . . Sister A. Bull was so overcome, she cried: 'Lord stay thine hand; I am an earthen vessel and can hold no more.' . . . Pray tell Mr. Davenport how times is with us, and get him, if possible, to come here, and you come with him."

This letter intimates that the revival was still progressing in Wheelock's parish. But already it had extended through the town, and Solomon Williams, of the first parish, with less zeal than Wheelock, was rejoicing in it. Under date of May 8, 1741, he writes to Wheelock :

"Rev. Sir: I never expect better fare than the rest of my brethren, but we have all had much better than our blessed and glorious Master met with from the world. As for me, God forbid that I should oppose a work which I believe in my soul is the great power of God, and I wish it may spread over the world. 'Tis very difficult to get ready to do any thing next week. I am infirm, and my hands are full night and day with people under conviction, and some I hope have been savingly enlightened this week. 'Tis a pleasing but a difficult work. I have just received a letter from my brother at Weston. He tells me there is much of it at Newtown, and it begins with them, and in other places about them. I have also a letter from my father, who tells me 'tis considerable in all their four towns. I perceive it spread fast in Norwich. Lord, let thy Kingdom come and will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Pray for your dear Brother, who is less than the least of all saints."

It was while the revival was extending in different localities, that the extravagances which in some cases attended it, began to attract attention and excite opposition. Stephen Williams, with his unquestioned piety and prudent spirit, thus communicated his apprehensions to Wheelock. He writes from Longmeadow, June 11, 1741 :

"I rejoice to hear of the prospering of the work of the Lord, yea, and shall

rejoice. But yet I must express my great fears, lest at such a time as the present, the malicious and subtle adversary of souls do bestir himself to the great prejudice of pure and undefiled religion. For Mr. Whitefield writes to Dr. Colman and Mr. Cooper, that the two Wesleys and their followers are gone into great extremes, and cry up a sinless perfection, and speak of such an essential union to Christ that they say they count it no robbery to be equal with God, and to the question put to one of them, can they sin? the answer was, can Christ sin? etc., and Mr. Hollis writes from London, (as in a letter now before me) that 'the work in Germany is somewhat like the work which has of late been in Pennsylvania, tho' standing in opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation; as also the work in England which is also very marvellous; yet preaching up justification by the blood of Jesus Christ, as having tasted death for every man, and as a propitiation, not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world,' etc.

And further, is there not danger lest (as Dr. Sewall expresses it, in a late sermon) the zeal of some be furious and disorderly, censorious and uncharitable, and not according to knowledge and sound judgment. You may possibly suspect me, either of cowardice or of lukewarmness, because of my confessing my fears, etc. Yet suffer me to propose a Q [uery]—that the Rev. Dr. Watts does in a treatise published this very year, 1741, entitled 'Questions proper to Students in Divinity, Candidates for the Ministry, etc.' The Q. is this, viz. Have I a settled bent and bias of soul to hate and avoid every sin, and to follow after God and holiness, according to the rules of the gospel, etc.? And adds this note—this is a better evidence of *true conversion* than any passionate efforts, or sensations, either of *love, grief or joy*. . . .

P. S.—It is proposed that the Rev. Mr. Ballentine be ordained at Westfield next Wednesday, and Mr. Noah Mirick at Springfield Mountains the Wednesday following. I am not without fears, there will be a revival of the Springfield controversy, upon this occasion, to the great prejudice of religion, etc. But God has the hearts of all in his hands." S. W.

The apprehensions, implied more than expressed, in this letter, were soon to be realized. A few days after it was written, Davenport left Southold for a campaign in Connecticut. The more zealous revivalists almost adored him. A descendant of the great John Davenport of New Haven, his social standing secured him high respect, while his devoted piety commanded the confidence of the most eminent revival ministers of the day. Whitefield said of him, that he knew no man keep so close a walk with God. Tennant said he was one of the most heavenly men he ever knew. Pomeroy ranked him before Whitefield in intimate communion with heaven. Parsons said, after enjoying his presence and labors, on this very tour, that no man he had seen lived so near to God, and declared, "I love him for his piety."

At Stonington, near by 100 are said to have been awakened by his first sermon. To Westerly, R. I., he was accompanied by a multitude, singing as they went. Under his preaching, there was a cry all over the house for conviction of sin. Wherever he went, he spoke with authority. He repeatedly declared, in public, his opinion of ministers, as converted or unconverted. The venerable Eliphalet Adams, of New London,\* was one whom he condemned. At Lyme, the impression made was less marked than at some other places. Capt. John Lee, of Lyme, (his letter is dated, Windham, Sept. 18, 1741) writes to Wheelock :

"Mr. Davenport's coming to our parish hath wonderfully enlivened the children of God. Four persons were hopefully converted while he was there. A great union in us about him, unless in two particulars, namely, condemning particular members as carnal, and publicly praying for his mother as unconverted, which things is liked by but very few."

Happily, we have in the Wheelock correspondence the joint letter of Davenport and his "armor-bearer," Daniel Tuthill, Jr., giving their own report of their proceedings and success. Under date of Lyme, Aug. 24, 1741, Tuthill writes, Davenport joining with him, and changing the "my" to "our," and the "I" to "we":

"MY (OUR) DEAR BROTHER IN THE LORD—My (our) love to you in the bowels of Jesus, and to your dear wife, who is a sister in Christ, as I believe, by information, and to all that love our dear Lord Jesus in sincerity. I suppose you have heard the account of the work of God before we came here, at Lyme, therefore I (we) will omit of writing the account that was heretofore. Therefore, when we came to Lyme, we was received kindly among many. But we was opposed by some, and that publickly, too. We was led to believe that it was the duty of Brother Parsons to go over to Southold, and we was led to pray to the Lord that he would direct in that matter, and my going over with him and be with him a few days, and the Lord did direct us to go over the Saturday fore last, the 15th day of this instant, and (stay) with him until the last Saturday. We preached in four Societies, and it had a good effect. The people's eyes are more and more opened about carnal ministers, and especially Christians that did rise to uphold them, and one of the ministers did promise to leave preaching until he was converted, that is, Mr. Jones. O blessed be the Lord for his profiting that he gave to Brother Parsons, while I was with him; for he was bold to speak in his and our Master's cause, and is to stay four Sabbaths, of which Brother Davenport has stayed two; and we are to write over to Bro. Parsons, that we depend that you, our dear brother to come one Sabbath, and dear Bro. Pomroy one Sabbath,

---

\* Tracy, in his *Great Awakening*, says Windham.

hat is, the two next Sabbaths, to be supplied in his stead. Don't consult with flesh and blood, but look to the Lord for direction, and the Lord be pleased to give you a sword, and give you wisdom and strength, and not salute no man by the way. We have looked to the Lord that he would direct you here, and desire still to look to him to this purpose, that he would send you and prosper you here, and by the way, then to return. Before I left my Brother Davenport the Lord often filled each of our souls with boldness and freedom to speak in the cause of our Lord. . . . We are in hopes of three converts in Mr. Grigby's Society, on Wednesday; the next day at Br. Parson's Society, we are in hopes of four white converts, and then on Thursday ten converts, and three of the number was Indians; and then after I was gone to the Island, Br. Davenport tells me there's 2 Indians and 2 whites converts; and now we are a going to Seabrook, and we trust the Lord will go with us, and stand in his own cause; and surely he will do great things yet, for he has promised, if we will but believe. O Lord, we believe; Lord, help our unbelief. O let us remember one another continually. We remain your loving brethren,

JAMES DAVENPORT. }  
DANIEL TUTHILL, JR." }

As intimated in this letter, Davenport, on the next day after it was written, crossed the river to Saybrook, where his classmate, William Hart, was settled. He asked Hart, who had one of the coolest and shrewdest heads in the colony, if he might preach in his pulpit. Before giving him an answer, Hart asked him if it was his way to condemn ministers as unconverted. He replied that it was. Hart asked him on what evidence he did it. Instead of a direct reply, he stated his object in doing it,—the purification of the churches, and the exposure of false guides. The result was that Hart refused him his pulpit, and he had to appoint a meeting of his own. Three of the neighboring ministers joined Hart in an endeavor to reason with him and convince him of his extravagances; but he choose rather to turn his back upon them, as carnal, and to go forth "without the camp, bearing the reproach." Capt. Lee followed him to Saybrook, and the great things which Davenport was to accomplish there had been widely heralded. But his labors were fruitless, and his stay was brief.

Pursuing his route to New Haven, he stopped at Branford, where Mr. Robbins hospitably received him. Against the objections of Mr. Robbins, he broke forth into singing on the way to the house of worship. He preached well, but closed with asking his "man" Tuthill to pray. At New Haven, ancestral



memories assured him admission to the pulpit first occupied by John Davenport. But Mr. Noyes' "Old Light" sympathies were too manifest to be concealed from Davenport's spiritual sagacity, and he pronounced him unconverted. Among the students in college his influence may have prevailed to a limited extent;\* but his visit took place just at the time of the fall vacation, nor can we find, on the list of under-graduates of that date, more than two or three of any note whose subsequent career could have been modified by Davenport's erratic proceedings.

Such a course as he had pursued created a prejudice, not only against himself, but against his sympathizers, and against itinerants generally. Of these, Wheelock was one, and not the least conspicuous,† and he was subjected to his share of reproach. A minister by the name of Cotton—perhaps Rev. John Cotton, of Halifax, Mass.—communicated to Mr. Gaylord, of Norwalk, Wheelock's brother-in-law, his objections to Wheelock's course. The latter wrote to Cotton, asking him to be specific. But the reply was not satisfactory, and the result was the following letter from Wheelock in his own vindication. It bears date, July 17, 1741, just as Davenport, having made himself notorious on Long Island, was commencing his career on the mainland at Stonington. From Winterbury Wheelock writes:

"REV'D AND HON'D SIR.—Yours of the 9th inst. I received, but han't had leisure before now to answer it, and I am as much at a loss to understand your letter, as I was before you wrote, to know what the objections were which you had against my conduct. Mr. Gaylord told me that you had some objections against my conduct, but could not give me to understand what they were. Whereupon I wrote to you, desiring you to acquaint me what they were. In answer to it you say, I don't acquaint you what the objections are which you have to make. Then you enter into a discourse about the unlawfulness of ministers leaving their own people from time to time, *Pro arbitrio*, on purpose to preach in other places where there are pastors fixed, constantly and painfully attending their charge, etc. And then towards the close of your letter, you seem to suggest that I do it, and therein break Christ's institution, condemn his authority, and please myself with a notion of doing eminent service for Christ,

\* Webster says, "Probably Buell and others." Buell was graduated, and probably left New Haven at about the time that Davenport reached it.

† Chauncy in his *Seasonable Thoughts*, 1743, classes him, Pomeroy, etc., with Davenport.

in a direct opposition to his declared will, trampling upon his authority, and casting his laws behind my back, etc. If that be the greatest head which you have to object against me, why can't you write it plain, without so much ambiguity, and then I shall know what to answer to, and if that be what you have to object, as I suppose it is, I answer:

1, I don't know that any good people among my flock, or any neighboring ministers who have known what my labors among my own people have been, have ever charged me with unfaithfulness to my charge. 2, I never went into any pulpit to preach without an invitation from the pastor, if there was any, nor of late without being desired more than once to do it. Others have often urged upon me that the evident success that has of late accompanied my endeavors, is a call of Providence to labor abroad when I can do it without neglecting my own flock, and it is evident to me that God, by owning and blessing the labors of the least and meanest of Christ's ministers, designs to mar the pride of the great ones of the earth, and get all the glory of his own work to himself. I know that there are some that call these things imaginary, and I pray God to give them better light and better hearts. I am fully persuaded it is the great power of God, and the very things that they have been so long praying for, and those that oppose it are found fighting against God. I can't but think it would be worth your while to take a journey down to Lebanon, Hebron and Coventry, and discourse with the Rev. Messrs. Meachem, Steel, Sol. Williams, etc. There you will be under advantage to satisfy yourself, if it be truly a work of God, if it is of the last importance for you to be satisfied of it."

But whatever might be said of Wheelock's zeal, or his laborious itineracy, he indulged in no extravagancies like those of Davenport. The name of the latter was becoming a reproach to the cause. Edwards freely expressed his disapproval of his course. He wrote to Burr at Newark, that he believed Davenport did more towards giving Satan and other opposers an advantage against the work, than any one person. He conferred with Stephen Williams on the subject, as the following lines from the latter, under date of Enfield, Sept. 19, 1741, while Davenport was yet in New Haven, indicate:

"The account the Rev'd and dear Mr. Edwards has given me of our dear Br. James D(avenport), has filled (me) with a great concern. Mr. E. fears that the measures which he pursues, will really hinder and obstruct the work of God in the land. O, can we do nothing—but by our prayers? Will he not be persuaded to lay aside such measures, that are stumbling-blocks in the way of some that (I trust) are truly religious. . . What need of discriminating and separating by m(en)? Won't Christ separate the chaff, and in his own time order the tares to be burned?"

At this point, another revivalist, ultimately only less obnoxious than Davenport, emerges into notice. Andrew Crosswell, a graduate of Harvard College in 1728, was settled some eight years later over the church in North Groton. He was as jeal-

ous of unconverted ministers, and as ready to pronounce upon the condition of his brethren as Davenport himself, except that he lacked opportunity. His excessive zeal and theological crudities subsequently (1742) brought him into controversy with Jonathan Dickinson, of New Jersey, and (1746) Solomon Williams, of Lebanon, Ct. His first letter to Wheelock displays something of his character, which will be further elucidated as we proceed. Under date of Sept. 20, 1741, he writes:

"I am this day informed by a very credible person that Mr. Mills of Canterbury told him, he durst not pretend to say that he was a converted man : that if ever, he was converted by degrees ; that he could not see through people's being *struck*—and that Mr. Mills spake slightly of Mr. Davenport, which is suspicious. I was before jealous of that man, because I heard that his brother, who is too charitable, (as 'tis called,) questioned his estate something. Wherefore, being in the utmost haste, I charge you and Brother Pomroy, by your allegiance to Christ, to search him thoroughly, and to bear testimony against him if found wanting."

To the above, Hezekiah Huntington, of Norwich probably, and a relative of Wheelock, appends the following :

"The above I was desired by the Rev. Mr. Croswell to forward. I think him a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and now would suggest to you the low ebb religion seems to be at. I hear not of any new converts in this Society since Mr. Pomroy left us (except one hopefully converted at Mr. Croswell's.) . . . the people anxiously inquiring after your coming to us, since Mr. Turner spake of the encouragement you gave of your coming this week. Mr. Lord hath not come forth in his public ministry to us since Mr. Davenport left us, and when he will is uncertain. The Rev. Mr. Moseley, we heard, is to preach to us the next Sabbath. I pray that I might wait on you here next Monday or Tuesday. I must speak with you before I go to the Assembly, as my affairs are so perplexed that I can't leave home at present. Our people in general will be exceeding glad of a sermon or two from you, tho' to some 'twill be very unwelcome ; but let it not discourage you. I hope God's glory and the interest of souls will be promoted by your coming."

Repeated applications were made to Wheelock similar to this from Norwich. The following from New London—as Wheelock became more acquainted with Davenport's imprudences—would scarcely appeal so strongly to his sympathies. It is from John Curtiss, under date of Oct. 15, 1741, and represents, undoubtedly, the extremists of the revival, soon to take their ground as declared Separatists :

"This salutes you from the Brotherhood in our Imanuel at New London, a little flock of lambs, greatly opposed, especially since our dear Br. Davenport, was here, and there is not one i. e. old professing Christian in the town perhaps

that comes out in favor of us. We therefore become a fit object of the care and ministrations of those who are set for the defence of the gospel, and knowing no man like minded, earnestly entreat you to visit this vine, and the town, poor town of New London, and rescue the ark from captivity and insults of the Philistines. . . . I can't assure you the meeting house if you come, but hope Mr. Adams will consent."

---

ART. V.—PROGRESS OF THE REUNION MOVEMENT.

By J. G. MONFORT, D. D., Cincinnati, Ohio.

The signs of the times are full of promise in behalf of the speedy reunion of the separated branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country. The parted stream is soon to flow again in one channel. Those who rejoice in the present, and can remember the painful past, are "like them that dream." To younger men, now upon the stage, who would learn the lessons of the past, and act well their parts in the closing scenes of the separation, the record of strife, so speedily followed by division; the prevalence of jealousies and competitions, marking so many years of the period of separation, and the rapid return of brotherly kindness and charity, hastening the fullness of time for reunion, must be an intensely interesting study.

For nearly a quarter of a century, Old School and New School were generally regarded as honorary titles, by those who accepted the one or the other. Until within a few years, a declaration in favor of uniting the divided church was generally received with suspicion, and very often with reproach. On either side, it was taken for granted that the sin of schism was chargeable upon the opposite party, and that the breach could only be healed by retraction or absorption. A great change has taken place in the spirit and views of both parties. The last few years of discussion and negotiation have been characterized by a rapid renewal of charity and confidence, and a growing evidence of oneness of sentiment and spirit, that are as surprising as they are grateful to every Christian heart. As the contest, which so soon ended in disruption, was mainly fed by evil surmisings and mutual accusations, so

the work of peace is to be a short work, because of the prevalence and power of love and meekness, of patience and forbearance, under the guidance of the God of peace.

Though reunion is almost universally regarded as an event of certain and speedy accomplishment, much may depend on what remains to be done, in order that it may be happy and permanent. The time and the manner of its completion should be wisely chosen, to render sure the harvest of blessing for which we have been sowing in tears. In order that the steps yet to be taken may be wise, it may be well to trace the progress of the movement thus far, and note the indications of Providence, pointing out the way by which the end may be best secured. The present posture of the question has not been attained by man's wisdom, but by Divine guidance, and there is still need of wisdom from on high. The providential leadings, from the first, seem to have been in favor of the method of consummation to which both churches are now tending. A retrospect of the discussions, overtures, negotiations and ecclesiastical action, in the progress of the reunion movement, will show that its friends, in contradistinction from those who have been unprepared for it or opposed to it, have ever been for it, on equal terms and without concessions or pledges. They have regarded both churches as intelligent and honest in their adherence to their common standards, and they have desired no other basis or bond of union. Whatever they may have done, in proposing explanations and pledges as a part of terms of union, has been by way of concession to others, and for the sake of union, which they feared might not otherwise be gained. The early friends of reunion, and all who from time to time have been brought to stand with them, have exhibited a remarkable unanimity of spirit and views on the whole subject. They have ever been prepared, for themselves, to form the union upon the basis of the standards alone, and they have ever declared the prevalence of restored confidence and fraternity to be the necessary and sufficient evidence of readiness for it. There is no doubt but this is the prevailing view, at this time, in both branches.

The first formal movement in favor of reunion, in which any definite opinion was expressed in regard to the basis on which it should be formed, began in 1864, when the Old School General Assembly met in Newark, N. J. A meeting was held of ministers and elders, in attendance upon that Assembly, to consider the question of reunion and to propose measures for its accomplishment. A paper was adopted and published, not only urging the necessity of union and suggesting measures adapted to prepare the churches for it, but presenting what was regarded as the proper basis for it. This paper says : " It is believed that the great majority in each branch sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures, and approve the same Government and Discipline. On this basis we may reunite, mutually regarding and treating the office bearers and church courts of each branch as coördinate elements in the reconstruction. There are difficulties in the way of repairing the breaches of Zion, which must be met and overcome by well-considered methods and in a spirit of forbearance and prudence. Reunion can not be accomplished, nor is it to be desired, without the restoration of a spirit of unity and fraternity. We believe this spirit exists and is constantly increasing. That which should first engage the attention of the friends of reunion should be to find out how far unity of sentiment and kindness of feeling prevail." Here the Confession of Faith, received as it prescribes, without anything more, is presented as the proposed basis; and the conditions precedent to union are, that there shall be, and be found to be, "unity of sentiment and kindness of feeling." This document was signed by 70 Ministers and 43 Ruling Elders, who were all present at the Assembly at Newark, and who represented the reunion sentiment of every section of the Church. Among the signers of the Newark paper are to be found the names of three editors of the Church, who also advocated its sentiments in their papers.

The same views were presented the same year in a sermon preached at the opening of the New School General Assembly, at Dayton, Ohio, in which these "three prime conditions"



of reunion were declared to be : 1. "An open and manly union on equal terms;" 2. "That both accept in its integrity the Presbyterian system of church order;" and 3. "That the reunion be simply on the basis of the standards which we equally accept." This discourse and the Newark paper were widely published and universally endorsed by the friends of reunion as presenting the true basis on which the two churches should be united. Before this, several Presbyteries of each body had memorialized their General Assemblies, asking them to take steps to secure the union of the two bodies, and in the religious press of the two churches much had been written in this behalf; but it may be safely affirmed that no other method of union was advocated by the friends of reunion, except upon the basis of the common standards of the two churches; while those who were opposed to union ever claimed the necessity of outside guards and guaranties.

The *Reunion Presbyterian* was established in January, 1855, as an organ of the friends of reunion. It was an exponent of the advanced thought and earnest feeling of its time in both branches. It advocated reunion upon the standards alone. Its editors and correspondents discussed the whole ground, since included in the plan of the Joint Committee. They approved all the principles to be found in the several items of that plan, and yet they propose the standards alone as the basis, and confidence as the bond of union. In their first number the editor says: "The two branches ought to come together on this sole basis of our common standards; and, if they can not do so, it were probably better that reunion should not be attempted." "The standards held in common by the two branches are the only standards held by each branch. If these standards are the freely chosen and approved basis of doctrine in each branch, why will they not be a suitable and sufficient basis for both churches united." "There is every reason to believe that each branch is pledged, in good faith and in the same sense of terms, to our common Confession." "If we undertake to interpret the Confession we shall not know where to stop." "The desire for a new

basis is the offspring of suspicion. Reunion must be the result of mutual confidence and love."

In the first official action of the two bodies, in the way of negotiation for reunion, the same view is very distinctly presented. Memorials had been sent up to the Assemblies of 1866, which met in St. Louis, Mo., and had been referred to the proper committees to report thereon. Two brethren, one of each Assembly, who were severally charged by their respective committees to prepare action in answer to these overtures, had an interview. The New School representative said: "Our brethren think that your Assembly should take the initiative." To which it was replied: "Our brethren are not able to see the propriety of this view, which is often expressed, but they are quite willing to accept the honor that it secures." A Joint Reunion Committee was proposed to negotiate for reunion on equal terms, and upon our common standards as the basis, and confidence as the bond. This was agreed to and action was accordingly prepared, which was approved by the Committees and adopted by the Assemblies. The action of the two Assemblies need not be recited in detail. The meaning of the writers of the action adopted, and of the friends of union voting for it, in either Assembly, was reunion upon the standards as the basis, to be accomplished as soon as mutual confidence and love were found so to prevail as to open the way for it, in regard to which the Joint Committee were appointed to confer and inquire and report.

When the Joint Committee was called to meet in New York in February, 1867, separate meetings were first held by agreement. The Old School found the notion still current that they should lead in the negotiations. Accordingly it was proposed, as the proper course of proceeding under the instructions of the Assembly, to unite with the other Committee in sending to the presbyteries of both bodies an overture asking answers to several questions, whereby the Joint Committee might be able to form an opinion as to whether there was such unity in doctrine, such restoration of confidence and fraternity, and such desire for reunion, and confidence that it would be harmonious and permanent, as to justify further steps for

its accomplishment. A paper to this effect was prepared and sent to the other Committee. The response to this communication led to a joint meeting and a full conference on the whole subject. In the Joint Committee, in justification of the proposition made by the Old School Committee, a member said, that under our instructions our first work was to inquire whether the two churches were so agreed as to be prepared for reunion; and, if this were found to be so, the union might be consummated upon our common standards, received and adopted in the use of the same formula of subscription. To this it was replied by a brother of the New School Committee: "We adopted the standards in the use of this formula thirty years ago, and yet we divided. We must have an understanding or we may again have difficulty." He was understood to be in favor of a written covenant, and there were others who agreed with him. However, as the conference progressed, and point after point was discussed, no opinion was so frequently expressed and assented to as that when it shall be made to appear that the churches are really prepared for union—when unity and confidence are found to prevail—the points of difficulty will have disappeared. This conference had the happy effect to make it manifest that the difficulties in the way of reunion were less than had been anticipated.

An adjournment for two months was agreed upon, and in the mean time information was to be sought in regard to the state of opinion in the different sections of the church, as every one might have opportunity. This meeting attempted nothing in regard to a basis. A member of the Joint Committee, soon after the adjournment, published, in the *Rochester Union*, the following statement, which fairly represents this meeting: "After a free interchange of views it was found that there was nothing in the way of reunion, so far as the members of the Committee were concerned, but it was deemed best to test, so far as possible, the sense of the people comprising the two general bodies of Presbyterians before taking definite action. For this purpose the Joint Committee adjourned to meet again on the first day of May. If the evidence which may be obtained by the members of the Commit-

tee in the meantime shall warrant, it is possible that at the May meeting some decisive action may be taken, looking to the consummation of union, though it may require some little time to perfect the work. Communications from members of the Church who are interested, and who desire to make suggestions, may be addressed to any member of the Committee."

When the Joint Committee met again, May 1, 1867, after full conference, a report was agreed upon, proposing the reunion of the two churches "as independent bodies, and on equal terms" and proposing "Terms and Recommendations, suited to meet the demands of the case." This report proposed that "the reunion shall be effected upon the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards," and yet its first item contained this explanatory clause: "Its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies, in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, and to Arminianism and Pelagianism on the other, shall be regarded as the sense in which it is received and adopted." There was a demand, especially by those who were opposed to reunion, or unprepared for it, made manifest in the public discussions, and reaching the Committee by private letters, for pledges and limitations in regard not only to doctrine, but other points. It seemed necessary, in order to meet this demand and fully discuss supposed differences, that terms of union should be presented in detail, and the Committee recommended their publication for one year for "deliberate examination" before a final report.

During the interval between the meetings of the Assemblies of 1867 and 1868, there were many who persistently demanded other and better pledges and limitations, and there was an earnest desire to meet the wishes of such persons, and, if possible, secure their acquiescence. At the same time there were unmistakable evidences that the friends of reunion preferred the standards alone as the basis. To this effect several presbyteries gave an expression of their views, and such was the report of the Committee appointed by the Philadelphia Convention to prepare a basis of union. The amendment of that basis, as moved by Dr. H. B. Smith, was not an expression of

his views of what the basis should be, but a peace-offering, intended to remove prejudices, in regard to the views of his own church. Those who voted for this amendment, did not desire it, for its own sake. Those of the New School who voted for it, had the same motives with the mover, and Old School men voted for it as an expression of confidence in Dr. Smith and his brethren. So strong was the preference for the basis, as reported, that the amendment was carried only by a vote of 68 ayes to 27 nays, the nays being chiefly from the Old School. Those who voted for the amendment, no doubt, agreed with Dr. Musgrave, who said at the time: "I would never have offered such an addition to the report of our Committee. I would have been perfectly satisfied to have it as it originally stood. But now that it has been introduced, and that by a respected brother of the New School, I find, sir, it would be impolitic to withdraw it, or vote it down; because, sir, it expresses precisely what the Old School would regard as satisfactory. Let us retain this amendment, and mark the prediction, that if you do, this union will be consummated." It may be safely said, that the only favor which this amendment ever received from the friends of reunion, was because it promised to relieve the doubts of many, who feared the want of unity of sentiment in the two bodies. In this direction, its adoption was eminently wise, and its usefulness has been very great

When the Joint Committee met again, in March, 1868, the almost universal expectation prevailed that the doctrinal basis of the Philadelphia Convention would be adopted. It would doubtless have received the approval of a large majority, in each branch. The Old School members of the Joint Committee proposed this, but for the sake of unanimity on the other side, another explanatory clause was added. This was regarded by many, for a time, as unfortunate, but it has resulted in good. Opposition to the explanatory clauses of the first item of the report, has been connected with acquiescence in all other parts of the plan on the part of one branch, while nothing has been lost on the other. There were, in both churches and in both Assemblies in 1868, minorities who were not sat-

ified with the report of the Joint Committee. In the Albany Assembly, the minority claimed that the Gurley Amendment did not sufficiently guard the church against error. A clause also in the action of the Harrisburgh Assembly, on the report of the Joint Committee, was interpreted by them as binding the united body to allow any doctrine, which it might be claimed had ever been held by any one, in either branch. These views were not acquiesced in by the majority in the Albany Assembly, but they were earnestly maintained by the minority, and regarded of such importance by some, that one after another of them said they would accept the other parts of the basis, if the explanatory clauses of the first item were dropped. This was regarded as hopeful by the majority, who had ever favored the standards alone, as the proper basis. It was thought to be highly important to satisfy as many of these brethren as possible; and, after consultation, a majority of the Old School Reunion Committee being present, it was deemed expedient that the Assembly, after passing the basis reported, should propose to the other Assembly, by way of making the basis "more simple and more expressive of mutual confidence," to drop from the first item the Smith and Gurley Amendments, and this was done by a vote almost unanimous. This action was telegraphed to Harrisburgh, and a special committee was sent to present it to the other Assembly, and ask its concurrence. Before this, every step that had been taken to prepare a basis, adding pledges and explanations, had been taken by way of concession to those who had been disinclined to union. Now this class, or many of them, seemed to have changed their views, and it required no sacrifice to accede to their wishes, which were the wishes, as it was believed, of a large majority in both branches.

After the Committee, appointed to go to Harrisburgh and present the proposed amendment, had left Albany, a telegraphic despatch was received from Harrisburgh, asking whether the Tenth Article of the basis would be given up, provided the proposed amendment of the First Article was assented to. It was thought best not to complicate the work of the Committee or to take up this proposition, which was only an in-



dividual suggestion. A different view, however, would have been taken, in all probability, if the thought had occurred to the persons consulted, that the dropping of the Tenth Article was really necessary, in order that the basis might be the standards pure and simple, and that this change would also be a concession to the minority of the other branch, requiring no sacrifice of principle in either party.

The Committee sent to Harrisburg arrived too late to accomplish their mission, and many friends of reunion felt that the effort to secure the amendment had left the negotiations in a most unfavorable posture. Time has shown that this was an erroneous opinion. The proposition for amendment gave reasons in favor of it, which could not but insure every one that it was offered in good faith and in growing confidence and fraternity, while the answer to the Protest of the minority gave conclusive evidence that the Old School Assembly did not distrust the soundness in the faith of the other body, nor regard it as desiring undue latitude of opinion. Nothing was done to weaken the bonds of fraternal confidence, but much to strengthen them. It is well, it may now be conceded, that it was too late for the Assembly at Harrisburg to consider the proposed amendment. It is well that the New School members of the Joint Committee declined to make any suggestions in regard to the amendment proposed at Albany, until their presbyteries had acted upon the overture regularly sent down by the two Assemblies. A new phase had been given to the reunion movement by the action of the Albany Assembly, and time was needed to consider it. It is also well that the *Pittsburgh Circular* was issued, in the interest of the supplemental action of the Albany Assembly, asking action, not only upon the basis, but in favor of the amendment. That circular had the effect to increase and unite the friends of union in the Old School branch, while it resulted in preparing that branch for reunion by the action of the Assemblies of 1869. It contained nothing to impair mutual trust and affection. It is well, moreover, that the consideration of the question of eliminating from the basis the Tenth Article, was postponed until now. Everything that has occurred since

the Assemblies met has resulted in leading the two churches toward an adjustment, by which the reunion will be on equal terms, and to each more fair, honorable and safe, than if either report of the Joint Committee had been adopted. It is a curious as well as an interesting part of the history of the reunion movement, that in yielding to the fears of the doubting, and to the importunities of opposers, by trying to add explanations to the standards for the sake of liberty or safety, almost all have become convinced that the most practicable and safe basis is the standards pure and simple.

Are any disposed to ask why it is that the Joint Committee have lost so much time in negotiating for explanations and guaranties? or why they did not at first, as their instructions indicated, propose "union upon the basis of our common standards?" The answer is obvious. The Joint Committee, like the whole Church, were not prepared for such a report without investigation and conference among themselves; and, if they had been, they were instructed by the Assemblies first to inquire whether reunion was "desirable and practicable," and whether it could be accomplished in a manner that would be "consistent with agreement in doctrine, order and policy, on the basis of our common standards, and the prevalence of mutual confidence and love." In prosecuting their inquiries, it was necessary to canvass all the questions in regard to which they prepared "Terms and Recommendations" in their reports. It was necessary that every question of supposed difference, whether of doctrine, order or administration, should be harmonized, not only in the Committee, but also in the two churches. When the Joint Committee entered upon their work, a majority of both churches believed that there were important differences in regard to doctrine, the examination of ministers, theological seminaries, publications, the mixed churches and other things. How could these questions be examined and discussed with any satisfactory result in the absence of some such terms as were reported? How, especially, could the agreement of the churches in regard to doctrine, which has ever been regarded as the main point of dif-

ficulty, have been ascertained but by the discussion, before the presbyteries, of some such statement as is furnished in the first item of the "Terms of Union" of the report? Something like these explanatory causes was a necessity to secure such a comparison of views as would give assurance in regard to unity of sentiment. To have proposed the standards alone as the basis of union, without any "Terms," as the reports call them, or "Measures," in the language of the Assembly, would have been to have insured defeat without the compensation of having made any progress toward the object in view. It is safe to say that without "Terms," covering the points of difference supposed to exist between the two churches, the discussions could not have been so conducted as to make manifest, in so short a time, the substantial unity which almost every one now believes to prevail. No other means, it is believed, would have served to bring the two churches so soon to trust each other and unite on their common standards.

The friends of reunion are now anxiously looking to the Assemblies of 1869 to complete the work. This may be done if the action of the presbyteries of the two bodies shall indicate a readiness for it. Some have erroneously supposed that this can not be done constitutionally, unless three-fourths of the presbyteries of each body shall have formally approved the same basis. There is no constitutional provision for reunion or for division. As reunion does not involve a change or modification of the constitution, as some may suppose, it is not, nor has it ever been, necessary to overture the subject to the presbyteries. If it were true that it involved a constitutional change, a vote of only a majority of the presbyteries would be requisite to carry it. The provision of the Constitution on this subject is as follows: "Before any overtures or regulations proposed by the Assembly to be established as constitutional rules shall be obligatory on the churches, it shall be necessary to transmit them to all the presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of them, in writing, approving thereof." (Form of Government, Chapter xii, Section vi.) The opinion that a vote of three-fourths of the

presbyteries is necessary to consummate reunion must have been inferred from the provision in the "Terms" reported by the Joint Committee. This was first proposed to put a quietus upon the charge of precipitancy, which was so widely made in both bodies. The right to form a union, like the right to agree upon a division, which both parties held in 1837, may be regarded as extra-constitutional. To heal a division can not be unconstitutional. It may be that explicit authority to form a union with an independent church may be wanting, and yet it is implied in the powers belonging to the General Assembly "of superintending the concerns of the whole church," (Ch. xii, Sec. v.) Unions have been formed by the highest judicatory of the Church with other bodies in several cases: with the Presbytery of Suffolk in 1749; between the Synods of New York and Philadelphia in 1758; with the Presbytery of Dutchess County in 1766; with the Presbytery of Donnegal in 1768; with the Presbytery of Charleston in 1811; and with the Associate Reformed Synod in 1822. In all these cases independent bodies were brought into union with our Church, and it was done by a mere resolution of our highest court.

The Assemblies of 1869 have not only the right to complete the reunion, but it is expedient to do so. The overture sent to the Presbyteries has failed in one branch, and the Assemblies now stand in relation to the question of reunion as before the negotiations were commenced, except that it is now well known that the two churches earnestly desire to be one, and it is perhaps as well known, or will be by the time of the meeting of the Assemblies, on what terms they desire reunion. The instruments have been tuned up to concert pitch and the strings are safe. The Assemblies are as well prepared to finish the work of union as in any case in the past. The defeat of the basis reported has proceeded in the Old School body on this assumption. The defeat was made sure by the *Pittsburgh Circular*. That paper asked for the amendment of the first item of the report by leaving out the Smith and Gurley Amendments; and it said, in regard to the article thus amended, "As it involves the creation of no new constitutional rule, nor

any modification of a preëxisting rule, *it is self-evident* that provided it is, in the mean time, indicated as the preference of the Church, it may be adopted by the Assemblies of 1869 and made the basis of reunion by a mere resolution." This "preference" has been declared by the Old School body almost without exception. If the action of the presbyteries of the other branch, in accordance with the recent suggestions of its Committee on reunion, shall favor the change of the First Article and the dropping of the Tenth Article, there can be no objection to union by the action of the Assemblies. Action by the presbyteries of one body in favor of union on the standards by vote of the Assemblies, and action in the other branch in favor of union upon the overture sent down, amended by leaving out the Tenth Article and the explanatory clauses of the First Article, are the same in substance and spirit, if not in form. Those who are not prepared for reunion may be expected to raise objections. It may be made a question whether the action of the Old School Presbyteries in favor of union upon the standards pure and simple is properly interpreted, as ruling out the Smith and Gurley amendments only, or, with them, also the Tenth Article, or also all other items of the terms of union. Mere technicalities, however, are not likely to hinder the Assemblies from acting, if they feel that they have the mind of the Church. It is to be expected that the friends of reunion will carefully inquire what is needed, even for the sake of form, and fully inform the Assemblies or instruct their Commissioners as to their wishes.

The question as to whether the Tenth Article shall be retained or expunged from the terms of union is one of little importance. A minority in both bodies are opposed to the examination of ministers in passing from one presbytery to another, as a means of defense against unsound doctrine, for the reason that this class believe it to be an invasion of the rights of the ministry. They hold that the constitution has provided other and better safeguards against error. These minorities have, of late years, been diminishing among the New School and increasing in the other body. At present, at least,

four-fifths in each branch are agreed on the subject. This is manifest from the action of the Assemblies and Presbyteries of each, in 1868, approving the Tenth Article, which abolishes the imperative clause of the examination rule of the Assembly of 1837 and yet acknowledges the right of examination. Both bodies hold the right of examination; and that it should be practiced only in exceptional cases. The action in favor of the Tenth Article gives satisfactory evidence, moreover, that the suspicions and jealousies which led to the adoption of the imperative rule have passed away, and that latitudinarian tendencies, charged in former times, do not exist. It is inconceivable that the two churches should have approved the Tenth Article on any other supposition than agreement in regard to the right of examination and mutual confidence.

The question arises, "Why should the Tenth Article be dropped after having been approved by large majorities in both churches?" The answer is, that it is "more expressive of mutual confidence" that the basis should be "the standards pure and simple." If explanations and covenants are not wise or needful in regard to doctrine, much more are they not so in regard to order and discipline. Our common standards require us to receive and adopt our system of doctrine, while we are only required to approve of our government and discipline. If the Tenth Article is retained, the union will not be upon our standards alone, but upon them with a special interpretation that will have the force of a constitutional rule. We may safely trust each other in this matter, in regard to which there is such harmony of sentiment.

It would be surprising if those who hold extreme views in regard to the right of examination should be found unwilling to dispense with the Tenth Article. If it remains in the terms of union, those who are in favor of the imperative rule of the Assembly of 1837, and who may believe that there may be need of such an enactment at some future time of danger from the prevalence of error, will be cut off by the covenant of reunion, if it is retained, from invoking the aid of such a preventive. On the other hand, those who deny the right of examination ought surely to be willing to give up an article de-



claring that "It is *agreed* that the presbyteries possess the right to examine ministers applying for admission from other presbyteries." A distinguished minister, who voted against the Tenth Article in the Harrisburg Assembly, said: "I am willing, for the sake of reunion, to grant the right of examination, but I can not vote that the right is granted in the Constitution." Every one holding such views will surely be willing to set aside an article that expounds the Constitution in opposition to his own convictions.

The Tenth Article may well be dropped, not only because of the substantial agreement of the two churches in regard to the doctrine of examination, not only because its retention is in violation of the fraternal and popular idea of union upon the standards, without explanation or pledge, but also because the question is fully and properly met by the Fourth Article of the "Terms of Union" reported by the Joint Committee, which provides that "No precedent which does not stand approved by both the bodies shall be of any authority until re-established in the united body." This article, which was also a part of the first report of the Joint Committee, was intended mainly as an adjustment of the question of examination. For this purpose it is all-sufficient and to be preferred to the Tenth Article. Precedents establishing the right of examination by the presbyteries stand approved by both bodies. Before the division there had been six deliverances on the subject, viz. : in 1801, 1816, 1825, 1834, 1835 and 1837, in all of which the right of examination is affirmed, except in that of 1834. There has been no action since the division, except by the New School Assembly of 1838, and this only repealed the imperative clause of the action of 1837. The Fourth Article of the "Terms of Union," therefore, secures in better form all that is needed in regard to examination, as well as all other precedents. If, however, the Fourth Article were also dropped, the reunion of two independent bodies on equal terms would nullify all conflicting precedents and usages, until approved by the united body. There seems to be no reason for retaining the Tenth Article, while there are many considerations in favor of abandoning it.

It may be regarded as settled that a majority in both churches will be ready to give up the explanatory clauses of the First Article. While there is no good reason for the opinion that these explanatory clauses allow a latitude of opinion or expression that would impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system, it must be confessed that they do imply distrust and suspicion. On the other hand, if they are left out and the standards alone are made the basis, there is in them all the liberty than any man can ask. No one will say that the Smith and Gurley amendments provide for any more liberty than is secured in Chapter xx, Section 2, where it is said: "God alone is Lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in an anything contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship."

This article will be closed by a suggestion in regard to the method of consummating the union, which is the result of a patient investigation and observation of the reunion movement from the first. The suggestion is that the union be formed by a concurrent resolution of the Assemblies of 1869, upon the basis of our own common standards, which is the basis of union in both churches, recognizing the independency, the equality and the authority of each body, with no other bond of union than the common formula of subscription, which binds the office-bearers and church courts of each body to each other, and to their common symbols of faith and government. There is now no need of a single one of the "Terms of Union" reported by the Joint Reunion Committee. They have served their purpose, and, like the articles of union, at first agreed upon between the Old and New School Presbyterians in the South, may safely be dismissed. The two churches are now known to be of one mind and heart in regard to every question which has been the subject of negotiation. Unity has been ascertained and confidence restored.

Such a reunion will be consistent with the action of the Assemblies of 1866, by which the negotiations were inaugurated. The proposition of these bodies was union "at the earliest time, consistent with agreement in doctrine, order and policy,"

union upon "the prevalence of mutual confidence and love," and union "upon our common standards." Neither Assembly speaks of any basis but "our common standards." The Old School Assembly directs its Committee "to suggest measures" if union is found to be "desirable and practicable." The New School Assembly indorse this action and instruct their Committee "to confer on the subject" with the Committee of the other branch. The conference of the Joint Committee, and the discussion and action upon their reports, have made manifest that reunion "is desirable and practicable." What more, therefore, is needed than to dismiss all outside covenants and come together on the common standards? It is only required that the Assemblies of 1869 resolve to unite and the work will be done and well done.

An examination of the several "Terms of Union" will make it manifest that reunion upon the standards, by a simple resolution, without the adoption of any one of these terms, is all that is needed. There is no need even of the *First Article*. Why should it be said: "The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament *shall be* acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice"? Our common standards declare this, and all our ministers, ruling elders and deacons, of both churches, have been ordained by its solemn acknowledgment. Why should the contract of union say: "The Confession of Faith *shall continue* to be received and adopted as containing the system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures"? Our common standards and our common ordination vows provide for this continuance. Why should we say: "The Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States *shall be* approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity"? Are we to take new vows? Reunion will not absolve any one from the responsibility of his ordination engagements. If the Assemblies unite upon the standards, as a basis, by a simple resolution, the united church will be as firmly bound to all that the *First Article* provides for, as are the separate churches. Let the *First Article* be dismissed, giving it the credit of having been very useful, in bringing the two

churches to see their agreement in doctrine. As to the *Second Article*, which provides that "All the ministers and churches, embraced in the two bodies, *shall be admitted* to the same standing, in the united body, which they may hold in their respective connections, up to the consummation of the union," it can not be doubted that a resolution, uniting two independent bodies, carries with it this equal standing. A special act of the united body would be necessary to deprive any minister or church of equal standing with all others. The language, "shall be admitted," implies that union will make a new church, in which the rights of its office-bearers and church courts need to be defined—which is certainly erroneous. No one can fear that an attempt will be made to deprive any minister or church of good standing in the united church, for any preëxisting cause. In regard to the imperfectly organized churches, for which this article also provides, happily we are agreed, and have so expressed ourselves by vote. We can moreover settle this matter, if it does not take care of itself, with less friction without a written covenant, than with one. The *Third Article* provides that the United General Assembly shall adjust the boundaries of the synods and presbyteries. It will have the right to fix the boundaries of synods, under the constitution, and it is best to leave the boundaries of the presbyteries to the synods, where it is left by the constitution. This article is therefore, to say the least, unnecessary. The *Fourth Article* provides that: "The official records of the two churches, for the period of separation, shall be preserved, and held as making up the one history of the church." This is the necessary result of the union of two independent bodies, on equal terms. It may be well, however, for the Assemblies, in the act of union, to state the fact that the two bodies unite as independent churches of equal standing and authority, though this would be the case if no formal recognition were made of it. This article also provides that, "No rule of precedent, which does not stand approved by both bodies, shall be of any authority until reëstablished in the united body." There is no practical need of this provision. In the case of conflicting precedents, the united body must decide, and in the case of

precedents of one body, not approved by the other, or in regard to which the other body had not acted, such precedents could not become of effect but by action of the united body reestablishing them. If a body is not bound by its own precedents, but may change them, much more is it not bound by precedents approved by only one of its constituent parts. The united body could not apply such a precedent, without in the very act approving it, and thereby reestablishing it. So, then, this part of the article is unnecessary also. If the Old School Assembly, before the union, were to abolish the imperative clause of the Examination Rule of 1837, there would be no conflict in regard to examination, or any other question, and perhaps no rule or precedent left, of any importance, that did not stand approved by both bodies. The *Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Articles* are as unnecessary as the first four. The consolidation of the corporate rights of the two bodies, and their application to their proper uses, the reconstruction of the various Committees and Boards, and the views and wishes of the Church in regard to Theological Seminaries, the united Assembly could and would carry out without a covenant. In regard to these questions, there is no difference of opinion, and there is no need of any further understanding, or of a contract between the presbyteries. When the Assemblies form the union, it will be sufficient to secure confidence in regard to all these matters, if there shall be a mere statement, perhaps in the preamble of the act of union, recognizing the fact that the expressed mind of the church indicates the proper adjustment of all interests concerned. The Assemblies of 1869 will be in session, in the same place, at the same time, and it will be easy to secure such understanding or action, in each body, before the union, as will assure to each party, that the action of the united body in regard to matters of administration will be such as will be acceptable. No basis is needed but the basis of each church—our common standards. There is not the shadow of danger, that the united Church will do anything against the views which the progress of the discussions and negotiations has shown to prevail among the large majority of both branches.

ART. VI.—THE INCARNATION, AND THE SYSTEM WHICH  
STANDS UPON IT.\*

By RICHARD S. STORRS, JR., D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE SOCIETY OF IN-  
QUIRY :

The system of religion which you seek to master, and which you hope afterward to proclaim—to the wider distribution of which you have severally consecrated your life—starts with the stupendous premise of the Incarnation of God, in the person of Jesus, the mechanic of Nazareth. That he who was ‘very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, and by whom all things were made, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made Man,’—this is the fact, put into such definite forms of expression by the early councils of Nicæa and Chalcedon, but which those councils themselves derived from the sacred books then as now revered in Christendom, and which we to-day, as well as they, find evident in them.

Intimations of it are given in the Old Testament Scriptures: in that long and life-giving expectation of a Messiah, which was itself vitally rooted in a sense of sin, to which this future Messiah was to minister, as law-giver, priest, or prophet, could not; in the progressive assembling around him of all the offices, honors, prerogatives—sacerdotal, prophetic, legislative, royal—with which the theocracy made the Hebrews familiar; in the interpreting radiance thrown forward on his ministry from that Angel of God’s presence, who had spoken to the fathers, and had led the tribes through the sea and the wilderness; in the ever more specific and illustrious descriptions which are given of his person: as the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, the star of Jacob, the consummating prophet, the king who shall rule from sea to sea, and in whom all na-

---

\*An Address, delivered before the Society of Inquiry, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, February 14, 1869.



tions of the earth shall be blessed; as he whose name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of Eternity, the Prince of Peace; whose goings forth have been from of old, even from everlasting; who is the fellow of the Lord of Hosts; to whom the august title is given, the Lord our Righteousness; who is directly identified, indeed, by more than one prophet, with Jehovah.

In all that immense body of prophecy of which the expressions that I have cited are only scattered surface-points, the Lord, who in the fulness of time is to come to the earth, is recognized and portrayed as human, indeed, a companion of men, teaching, working, suffering, dying; but as still associating with this humanity a certain transcendent and incomparable nature, which sets him apart from all who had preceded, and makes him the final King of the World. Toward him, from the first, the ancient system of rule and rite, as well as of instruction, continually pointed. The promise of his coming made its influence ennobling, and its splendors significant. And therefore that system, while it was of course superseded at his advent, was as well thereby illustrated. Even as the sun, arising in the morning, illumines every twig and spray on which the night dews have distilled, so all those real but dim predictions of the glory of the Lord, which had been either moulded into words or crystalized into rites, beneath the shadows of the Hebrew experience, were turned to more than diamond brightness, amid the light of his appearing.

Thenceforth he is revealed, as before he could not be; and in a majesty that only towers more loftily to the end, he walks before us amid the New Testament. All the evangelists tell us of his miracles. With matchless clearness, and from different points they delineate his character, in which neither enmity nor intimacy detected a flaw. With an exactness that only measures the impression which his words had made on them, they rehearse for us the sayings, parables, discourses, in which absolute truth reveals itself through an inimitable expression. They all present him in that sublime solitariness, of experience and of nature, which seems the penumbra of Deity

eclipsed: taking nothing from others, yet always imparting what they need; sympathetic with those of most different classes, but not stirred by their triumphs, nor alarmed with their fears; as untouched by the prejudice and the passion of his time as the sky is by mists; as unmindful of distinctions of rank among men, as the all-including sunshine and air; confessing no sin, and asking no forgiveness, but comforting the poor, healing the leprous, and pardoning the guilty, with the mercy as well as the authority of God; patient, amid neglects; tranquil, before assailing rage; on the eve of his death looking forward to a kingdom as wide as the world; promising paradise, from the cross, to his disciple.

The three earlier evangelists tell us particularly of the wonderful events that heralded his ministry: Matthew, of the wise men hastening from the East, because they had seen his signal star; Mark, of the dove that came upon him at his baptism, and the voice that broke from the skies to proclaim him the Son beloved; Luke, of the song of the angels at his birth, and the weloming adoration of saints in the temple. They all brighten their pages with the glory that was manifest at his transfiguration. And they all exhibit the broken grave, in which his body could not be held. While John, after them, opens his gospel—the last in order, the highest in view, and dealing more than either of the others with the interior life of the Lord—with those majestic and unsearchable words, beneath which, as in a mystic temple, faithful hearts have ever since mused and worshipped: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory.”

There can be nothing added to this, to make its statement of the fact of Incarnation more decisive. But in the epistles which follow it in the Scripture, though written before it, we find the same conception of the Lord, involved, and regnant; and the different expressions which are given to it, in different connections, and by differing minds, only make the exhibition of it more vivid and complete.

Everywhere it confronts us in the letters of Paul: who

claimed to have received his gospel from on high, and to whom the Lord who had appeared to him at Damascus was Son of Man, was man himself, the second Adam, but to whom, also, he was a being who had descended to this estate from one of preëxistent glory; who saw in him the image of the invisible God, the creator and upholder of all things that are, in heaven or in earth—who had been before them, by whom they consist, and for whom, as well as by whom, they were made; who describes him, in so many words, as “over all, God, blessed forever;” who always insists on such a supreme faith toward him as would be idolatrous toward any creature; who is himself the consecrated servant of this Divine Master, and who blesses in his name, and denounces anathema on them that love him not.

We meet the same governing conception of the Christ, in the letters of Peter: who is the slave, as well as the apostle, of this sovereign Lord; to whose eye his coming has brought marvellous light into all the earth; who counts it happiness and honor enough to be reviled for him; who sees Christians made partakers, through him, of the Divine nature; and who sees the angels desiring to look, but with baffled vision, into the mysteries of his nature and work. James, whose epistle is specific in its purpose, and ethical in its contents, only touching incidentally on the doctrine of Christ, is yet as truly his ‘slave’ as was Peter or Paul. He sees in him the Lord of Glory. He speaks of his name as the ‘goodly name,’ which its enemies ‘blaspheme.’ He exhorts to patience in expectation of his coming; and he seems to refer to him in admonishing those who would judge others of the one law-giver, who is also the judge, whose prerogative it is to save and to destroy.

And John, in the epistle which he adds to his gospel, declares that whoever denies the Son hath not the Father, and that he is the true God and eternal life; while, in the visions of the apocalypse, he sees this Jesus, the first and the last, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who leads to triumph the heavenly armies, and whose name is called the Word of God. His descriptions of him seem almost literally to trans-

figure the language in which they are uttered. He sees him the centre of celestial adoration. And while he may not, without idolatry, worship the angel who has shown to him the New Jerusalem, he falls, as if dead, at the feet of this being, whose countenance is as the sun shining in his strength, and who has the keys of hell and of death.

The whole New Testament thus becomes vivid, to the eye that looks attentively upon it, with this implied or express representation of the person of Christ: as of one who had taken the nature of man into a union, mysterious but intimate, with his preëxistent and Divine constitution; who was therefore God, manifest in the flesh, and in seeing whom men had seen the Father. To this conception of him, indeed, the whole Bible brings tribute; and only when this is clearly unfolded does the unity which pervades its manifold parts, and subordinates their varieties to a single and sovereign line of instruction, become apparent. Then, 'what is latent in the Old Testament is made patent in the New;' and Messianic prediction links itself so closely to Christian description that the gap of four hundred years between them is passed by us without a jar.

Up the steady ascent toward this clear declaration of the nature of Christ—the Law-giver, Redeemer, and King of mankind—we journey from the verse which tells us that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. We reach it, at last, in the words which tell us that in that beginning was the Word, by whom all things that are were made; and that He it is whom apostles have beheld, dwelling among them, full of grace and full of truth. We do not marvel, after that, that he claims a love which surpasses all other, where it does not suspend it; that no force resists, and the grave can not hold him; that to him the saints, in the hour of death, commit their souls; that in his name their miracles are wrought; that he looked forward to a kingdom world-wide, and enduring forever; that the awful function of final judgment, with the determining of men's destinies for eternity, is in his hands; or that the angels are commanded to worship him; or that the benediction which closes the Bible, from the hand of him who

had leaned on the breast of this Lord at the Supper, contains only his name: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."

But the fact thus emphatically declared to us by the Scriptures—the immense, the truly unsearchable fact, of the Incarnation of God in his Son—does not stand by itself, an isolated fact, a glittering pinnacle or a detached out-work, in the manifold system which, by those Scriptures, is brought to our view. It is not only a part of this system. It is its foundation; the solid, majestic, irremovable basis, on which all special discoveries of truth and provisions of grace are raised and braced. Isaiah had said, speaking for God, seven centuries before the Lord appeared: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste." Both Paul and Peter afterward apply this to the Lord whom they adore and serve, and in whom they affirm that Christians are built up, a spiritual house, a holy temple, for the habitation of God through the Spirit.

The image which thus originates in the Old Testament, and is repeated in the New, seems plainly taken from the great hewn stones which were set by Solomon at the base of the walls beneath the Temple, and which are believed by competent observers to be still in their original places. It is one of the striking discoveries of our time that there they remain. Successive destructions, by Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Roman, have levelled the walls which were afterward reared on them, till the valleys beneath are choked with the ruin. Not only the ceilings of gilded cedar, the columns of brass, the monolithic pillars, the capitals of lily-work,—the great gateways have vanished; the magnificent viaducts, that linked the Temple to Zion on the one hand, and to Olivet on the other, have disappeared; and the far greater part of the structure which now meets the eye of the traveler, as he looks upon Moriah, is indisputably modern. And yet, amid all changes and destructions, those immense hewn stones, whose beveled edges still show the touch of Phenician workmen, there abide. And nothing, except a convulsion of nature that shall make

the earth itself swell and crack, will ever heave them out of their places.

And so, says the prophet, shall be laid—and so, add apostles, has been laid—in the coming of Christ into the world, the enduring foundation, on which the whole system of truth and of salvation for mankind is to arise. The solid corner of all is set in that unique constitution of his being, in which are hidden supremest wonders of power and glory. Because he is not, in their conception, a man like themselves, imperfect and finite, though of a rare religious genius; because he is not an angel, merely, bidden of God to mask his brightness beneath the figure and face of man, but not able really to assume our nature or partake our experience; because he is, as they behold him, the Son of man, yet also truly the Son of God—whom neither chance, nor force, nor time, can strike with change; in whom eternal perfections are combined with a tender and suffering sympathy for our need—therefore do his messengers command that this Lord be trusted forever by those who seek for their salvation; therefore do they show him the source and the support of that divine life which through him is revealed, to all the world, in all the ages. The mystery of Incarnation, which they recognize in him, becomes the essential and unchangeable foundation on which is established whatever they afterward require or declare. And it is impossible not to feel that if this had been dislodged from their minds, their whole conception of the gospel which they published would have been overturned. Not in a new argument of reason, not in a new vindication of virtue, not in the evanescent beauty of a pathetic human career, but in the personal revelation of God, through the life of his Son, was laid for them the corner-stone of every truth and every warning, of every command and every hope. And because that could not be shattered or shaken, they knew that their gospel should stand forever.

But if it be true that this Incarnation of God in his Son has been accomplished, and that this is the enduring basis of whatever is subsequent and peculiar in the gospel, then it may fairly be presumed that the structures which arise from a base



so transcendent will be as majestic as itself; that they will match, in their sublimity, the corner-stone on which they are builded. And to an imperfect and rapid illustration of the fact that they do so, I shall solicit your thoughts this evening. We see how amazing, how unsearchable, is the fact that God in Jesus came personally to men, to manifest himself, and to interpose for their well-being. We know that this fact stands directly related to a system of Truth, and of human Salvation; to a definite scheme of Christian Experience; to the constitution of the Church in the world; indeed, to the Christian Civilization of mankind. Let us see, then, how these correspond in their grandeur with that stupendous fact of history which is their premise.

And first, THE SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH, which has for its prime element and condition the Incarnation of God in Jesus: what must that be, to be in harmony with the mystery and the majesty of this sublime fact? We feel what it must be; and we see what it is. And, blessed be God! the two correspond.—It can not be a mere ethical scheme, however strict, and careful, and comely, which is built upon this transcendent premise; a code to govern men's personal morality, or to regulate their relations and conduct in society. It can not be any entertaining instruction in biography, or history; any interesting series of geographical hints, or archaeological suggestions; any sketch, even, of what had otherwise been unknown to us, in the philosophy of human nature, or in the sciences and arts which successively declare themselves as experiment and research go gradually forward. All these might evidently, and should more naturally, have been left to be attained by man for himself; or, at most, have been brought to him by prophets and psalmists, by commissioned historians, and illumined apostles, rather than by the Son of God, in whom essential Divinity was enshrined.

It was not needful, it was not suitable, to introduce these to the knowledge of men, that God himself become incarnate. The miracle is too vast for any such result to sustain a rightful proportion to it. It were like building a house of thatch on a base of marble—like rearing the frail clay cottage of the

peasant on the foundations of the palace for a king—to establish nothing more than such knowledges as these, such scraps and fragments of superficial information, on the infinite fact of Incarnation. We know, on the instant, that other and grander elements than these must be combined in that great system which has its foundation in a truth so transcendent; that in it must be brought into ample, impressive, inspiring exhibition, such facts concerning God, and such concerning man, as without it would have stood still unrevealed; that the whole immense though ideal structure, to its topmost pinnacle, must be moulded and marked by the same sublime majesty which manifestly belongs to its primary principle.

And so we find it to be, in fact. The spirituality, and essential immortality, of the nature of man, whereby he becomes of kindred with angels, and has an existence that runs parallel with God's; the sacredness that belongs to even the body, since the Son of God assumed our flesh, and took it with him to the skies; the near and the unbounded Eternity, which waits for each—with its separating assize, conducted by the Son of God and of Man, with its dread adjudications, and the destinies unspeakable, of glory or of gloom, for both of which it offers the theatre; the vast, populous, unimaginable realms of Spiritual Life, to which we are allied by nature, and into which we pass at death, although as yet there falls no hint from them on us, and comes no murmur across the chasm which separates us from them; the dark, appalling mystery of Sin, whose shadows stretch backward to the morning of time, whose shadows spread upward, beyond our furthest ken or thought, to that first and chiefest rebellious will whose malign activity glooms through history, and whose craft waylaid, while its malice assailed, the Lord at each step; the character of God, in the wisdom and holiness which it ever unites, and the tenderness which it reconciles with an absolute justice; the sovereignty of God, which the very frame of the universe implies, but, associated with this, the willingness to forgive, the readiness to answer prayer, of which the solid and shining universe gives us no intimation; the mystery, even, of the Divine Nature,—the three-fold unity, which makes it forever perfect in

itself, while forever inaccessible to our aspiring finite thought, and before which archangels, as well as we, can only bow in wonder and worship :—these, and the like, are the truths which are exhibited throughout the New Testament, as completing and crowning, in their wonderful unity, the initial truth of the Incarnation.

‘Mysterious,’ do you say they are? ‘surpassing reason; appealing only to faith’? Of course they are. So is that mysterious on which the revelation of them is based. No equal fact appears elsewhere in history. No parallel to it is caught by science, in the grasp of its analysis, or on the lens of its telescope. And these other truths to which we rise from it, in all their amazing reach and height, are only still proportioned to it. They harmonize in their grandeur, as they are profoundly connected in their development, with that amazing affirmation of the Gospel, that, after sending his messengers and prophets, God came at last, in the person of his Son, to the world which had been wandering from him; and that in the birth of the babe at Bethlehem was a true, and the only, Incarnation.

Whoever denies this, and holds that Jesus was merely the son of the carpenter and of Mary, denies also, in sure result, if not in immediate connection and consequence, these other truths confederated with it. The whole New Testament comes to be, in his conception, a heterogeneous and confusing collection of ancient sayings, myths, and letters; in which fact and fancy are inextricably entangled, and arguments are sought to be built upon legends. And the faith of the church will inevitably seem to him made up of dreams, and ephemeral superstitions. But whoever holds that fact as certain, which the prophets shadowed forth before it occurred, and which evangelists afterward recorded, that in the birth of the young child Jesus the Eternal Word was himself made flesh, and dwelt among us—he will see these other truths ascending from it; harmoniously, solidly, based upon it. According to the corner, is then the structure. And by the solemn grandeur of the foundation, may we outline and measure the great temple of Truth which is afterward reared upon its rock.

And as with the Truth which is declared to us, in connection with this premise of Incarnation, so, also, in the second place, with that SYSTEM OF SALVATION, which is in like manner conditioned upon it; and which offers itself to man's acceptance, as rising from this corner-stone. It also corresponds, in its mystery and majesty, with that sublime fact which is primary in it, and is as unique as that would plainly presuppose.

It is a system of Salvation which is offered, and not of simple Education; and so we should presume that it would be, when we remember that it starts with the Incarnation. It is a system only gradually brought to its perfect development; whose unmatched plans, and extraordinary agencies, required centuries for their evolution, though, when completed, it opens to all its welcoming doors.

It proposes to man the inward renewal of his moral nature; its re-creation, in Christ Jesus. Not the outward amendment of manners only, the decorating of life with finer fashions and more various accomplishments, is the purpose of this system; but the perfect and final banishment from the heart of the prides, lusts, and vehement passions, which prevail in it by nature, and which have been ever fortified by habit; the intimate and permanent establishment in their place of a love toward God, and equally toward man, which shall make nature more significant, the Bible more luminous, celestial spheres more near and dear; which shall be the element, in each one who receives it, of all goodness and beauty, the life of sanctity, the beginning of heaven.

It proposes to men still more than this: even such a vindication, through the work of the Lord, of the holiness of God, and of the essential purity and authority of the law which he maintains in his moral creation, that one who has broken that law can be pardoned, on condition of his penitence, and yet no shadow be cast by that pardon on the law itself, or on that eternal regard for it in God which is his glory, as well as the necessary ground and guaranty of universal well-being.

The work proposed to be accomplished in that Salvation, which is founded on the fact that God in Christ became incar-

nate, is therefore transcendent as is the fact. It is essentially such a work as poetry might dream of, but could not prefigure; as no speculative philosophy, however daring, could affirm to be possible. The exhibition of it to the mind of the world enlarges that mind, and summons it to exercises of a height and an intensity unknown before, as well as enriches it with new conceptions of God and of the Universe.

And as is the work, in its nature and design, so are the Divine operations and endurances by which it is affirmed that this is accomplished. They are such as man never before imagined; such as must have continued beyond the reach of human thought, except for the Scriptures which record them.

It is not by simply coming to the world, amazing as that is, that the Lord is to set the penitent free, to make the publican devout, and the weeping harlot an heir of heaven. It is not by speaking sweet words of wisdom; nor by charming men to goodness with his finished example; nor even by suddenly startling their senses, and arousing their souls, with his wonders of power. It was not thus, and by such means alone, that the Lord made atonement for human sin. But it was by submitting to that stroke at his life, which malice had prepared, which treason assisted, which a timid and haughty ferocity dealt, and which makes the overshadowing tragedy of Time; by bowing in acquiescence to that anguish in the garden, which is as inscrutable as is the nature which it searched and enthralled; by yielding his body and soul to the Cross, over which the skies grew dark without cloud, and under whose weight the strong earth shivered. According to all the consenting testimonies, the Lord of Glory went through death, to save us from it. He drank the cup of bitter woe, that we might quaff, from heavenly chalices, the wine of life. All faintness and gloom, which his mysterious being could know, he folded round, he took within him, that we might walk celestial streets with palm and harp, in robes of white. And only when this vast anguish was ended, this sacrificial death endured, was God, not pacified by it, not changed in character, or made more merciful than he would have been otherwise, but shown to be so holy while gracious, so purely, ineffably just, that the

scoffer and the robber, the adulterer, the assassin, turning to him, might be forgiven.

And yet, marvellous as is this, it is matched by the marvels of that Divine work which purifies the soul. It is through the intimate personal operation of the Spirit of God, by his indwelling light and grace shed abroad in the souls of them that believe, that the heart is discharged of selfishness and sin, and is filled with the holy beauty and triumph of a supreme virtue. The truth is his instrument; that novel, majestic, and quickening truth, of which already I have spoken. But even this is only the instrument. The essential power by which this amazing change is wrought, is that same energy of the Holy Ghost by which prophets and apostles before were inspired, which in the Lord was ever revealed. As a wind, as a fire, this influence comes. But wind and fire combined do not suffice to set before us its invisible power, its pervasive activity, its renewing effect. It reaches the inmost springs of life; turns gloom to gladness, lust to charity, passion to peace; till the soul, that was a den of darkness, becomes a temple—alight with love, ringing with praise, the breath of constant supplication filling it as with incensed air.

And then comes the end of this Salvation: not in any such prizes as men seek on earth; not in any such goods as heathen dreams or unbelieving philosophies have fancied possible, beyond the present. Its end is in the immortal result toward which the change of spirit and life experienced on earth continually points; in a power ever exercised, yet ever renewed; in the inward sanctity, made complete; in the fellowship of saints, our eternal possession; in the wisdom, before which all secrets open; in a joy ecstatic, that touches with its intenser beauty whatever surrounds it; in the perfect love, that makes each work an exulting worship, toward him once suffering and now crowned; in the beatific vision of God! Heaven is first a state within, and then a City of God above. And when that City shall be gained—we hardly need the promises of the word to tell us that its gates shall be of pearl, its pavements of transparent gold, and all its foundations of precious stones. Such prophecies of it are now imbedded in every



soul regenerate through Christ, which has his spirit of grace within, and which already fore-knows through him immortal blessedness waiting for it.

Such is the Salvation which is offered in the Gospel, as based on the transcendent fact that God in Jesus became incarnate. I submit that it is, in all its parts, as glorious and wonderful as in its foundation. It matches that, with an equal sublimity. If one denies or questions that, all this will certainly seem to him unreal, imaginary, at best uncertain. But if one truly accepts that fact, as the prophets foreshadowed, and as the apostles set it before us, then this surpassing system of Salvation, conditioned on it, will be seen by him in all its proportions harmonious with it:—the corner-stone, that mystery of the world, that God became a little child; but the structure raised on it, not a paltry and perishing refuge of lies, not any superficial and temporary structure erected by human skill and will, but a temple of God, sublimer in conception than creation itself, with lucent gates, and mighty walls, and golden roof, within which the world may rest and worship!

Observe, too, thirdly, how the same rule applies to that special scheme of SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE which is designed to be realized in Christians; which is, in fact, realized in them, as they more vividly recognize the fact, and more utterly yield to its impression, that God in Jesus became incarnate. It, too, surpasses the ordinary experience of men of the world, we may not say as much as that, but in like manner as that surpasses, all other recorded facts of time. A wholly new realm of such experience has been opened to men, since Christ came out of the heavens from God, and condescended, for our salvation, to take our nature, and suffer our human perils and pains.

Take the penitence, for example, which men feel for sin, as committed against the God of nature, and contrast it with that which they feel, and should feel, for the sins they commit against God who comes to them in the person of his Son. Penitence is, as its name implies, among the heathen a fear of pain; of the pain which comes in the punishment of offenses. It may be, therefore, sharp and severe, and to some extent

salutary, as restraining from such offenses in future. But it wants, of necessity, any deep moral basis. It exists among the ignorant, rather than the cultured. It corresponds, not to the nature of offenses, but to the disasters expected to follow them. It is not of the heart, and it therefore wants all spiritual efficacy; while it vanishes at once when the fear of the penalty, by which it was inspired, has been removed. Even in this form, the philosophers of the old world despised it as foolish, and the governing minds sought to put a check on it. 'It is only by the superstitious,' Plutarch affirmed, 'that the Gods are represented as angry, or as threatening punishment.' And so wise, just, and magnanimous a prince as Marcus Aurelius, in the face of his own maxims of toleration, could persecute the Christians because the tendency of their doctrine seemed to be to excite in men a new fear of the Deity. The natural conscience has not been obliterated, outside of Christendom; but its voices have been feeble, and fear alone, with no quick and consecrating element of love, has been expressed in the penitence it has prompted.

Contrast with this, then, that Christian emotion represented by Peter's bitter tears, of shame and sorrow, with no trace of fear. Contrast with it Paul's tremendous experience, when he spoke of himself, after years had elapsed since his conversion, as 'the chief of sinners;' as 'less than the least of all saints;' as 'the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.' Contrast with it that most trenchant and terrible of all the utterances of the sense of sin which have been made in human language, which is given us by the same apostle—writing, in the full maturity of his years and his Christian experience, and in the near prospect of heaven, the seventh chapter of his epistle to the Romans.

Penitence, under the Christian system, was meant to be, and it properly is, a wholly different, a far more searching and vital thing, than it was or could have been before. With the vision of God descending to the earth for man's salvation, there comes, to each soul which it irradiates, a vivid sense of the dreadfulness of sin, as well as of the goodness and clem-

ency of God. Under this supreme and illuminating view of his grace and condescension, an offense even of the heart against him—unuttered, and unacted—becomes the occasion of pains that rush, like fiery shapes, with stinging scourges, through the soul. And any rebellion against his love, who comes to us not in nature alone, or in the unseen guidance of history, but in the person and life of his Son—every holy instinct flames to passion against it! Eternal penalties seem not too vast to be its meet and sure reward. There is, therefore, no exhibition of penitence throughout the Scripture—from the psalmist who foresaw, to the latest apostle who looked back upon, the coming of Christ—which is not interpreted and justified to us, when we accept him as not the babe of Jewish parents, but the Son of the Most High, whose birth into the world was a true Incarnation.

And yet, with this keener and more penetrating penitence, comes a faith as wholly unknown before; a faith that is grateful not only, but adoring; that counts no labor too great to be attempted, no possible sacrifice too great to be made; that believes without argument, endures without remonstrance, is happiest under the heaviest cross; that expects success amid whatever disasters; and that no more fears death, than did the Lord the waves which he trod on. Such a faith as this had no name for it, in either the Greek or the Roman world, till the Gospel touched their very language, and charged it with meanings which they who had formed it had never conceived. No Being had appeared to call it forth. It was not known that the soul of man was capable of it. And well might the hardest and the most practised wonder, when delicate women, sustained by it, stood naked, abashed, but wholly unshrinking, before the onset of wild beasts; when men, inspired by it, sang praises, as destroying fires curled round them at the stake.

A faith had come to manifestation, and a heroism born of it, of which the world, with all its experience of a strenuous ambition and a passionate courage, had seen no instance. And it was not strange that the Circus of Nero should after a little be occupied by the Temple—that the vast and furious

Pagan empire, which had thought to extinguish in ashes and blood the new religion, should be transformed to the scene of its triumph—when such a faith, so supreme and invincible, sprang up from the truth with which the Gospel commenced.

And with this faith came joy as well: a joy which finds eager and liberal utterance throughout the epistles; which was not destroyed, was hardly abated, by all the shocks and persecuting storms through which believers were called to pass; a joy that made the humble glad, and the dying triumphant; that turned pain to a blessing, and poverty to wealth; that took the sorrow from all things but sin, and that echoed, from caverns and dens of the earth, the songs on high. Not only new love toward God was experienced, and a wholly new charity toward mankind; an ardent, peculiar, inspiring sympathy was born in believers toward those who were with them the followers of the Lord. For the first time in history, hearts touched, and clasped, and clung to each other, with a wholly unselfish and reciprocal love. And in the exaltation of feeling and thought to which they aspired, and were mutually aided, they had a sense of intercourse with God, and even of oneness in spirit with him, through the grace that had come to them by the Lord Jesus Christ—such as poets before had never imagined, and prophets themselves had never known. The hope of glory which shot up within them, in intimate connection with this mutual love, this communion with God, and this thrilling sense of his life in their souls—it was not a hope so much as a vision, and a sure expectation, of that which should come; a vision that brought the future near, and made the fore-gleam of its splendors irradiate the paths that would otherwise have been darkest. They walked on the earth as those whom every hour brought nearer to choiring hosts, and emerald bow, and the sweet peace of heights supernal.

All these were the elements vividly interfused, vitally blent, in that experience which the earlier Christians knew and showed; the experience of which still shines before us, in the liturgies which they loved, in the works they accomplished, in the very catacombs where, amid the darkness, they suffered and wrought. And such is the experience which is realized

to-day, wherever men, with their conviction, accept the same fact, that God in Christ, for man's salvation, became incarnate. In books you find it; in sermons, songs; Confessions of Augustine; epistles and stanzas of Bernard; Port Royalist or Puritan essays and letters. In life you find it: where penitence and faith still dwell together; where sorrow has lost its power to hurt; where hope disperses the gloom of sickness; where fellowship with God gives the conscious soul immortal peace; where the earth is sacred because it is the Lord's, and the grave because he lay therein; where life is precious because it may serve him, and death is dear because it swiftly lifts one to him.

By such an experience—unknown in the world till Christ appeared—the earth is made more lovely, always; history nobler; men's homes glow with diviner light. It can not be wholly spoken in words. It can not be imaged by any art. The very soul dilates before it, and opens a new sensibility to contain it. It so far transcends the spiritual state which ethics contemplate, that the moralist regards it as purely ideal. And yet we know it to be real; the very life within the life, to those who feel it. And when we see, with the utmost distinctness, how wonderful it is, how deep in its reach, how amazing in its height, how all-involving in its scope—when our hearts are most stirred by the praises which it prompts, or our tears gush most freely at the moans of its penitence—we still can only say, at last, 'It matches that on which it rests!' The corner-stone of the Incarnation, received into the mind by faith, could have no less an experience reared on it, in the capacious soul of man! Apostles, martyrs, saints of God—their feeling has never been too signal, of grief or faith, or of uttermost joy, when we test it by the law suggested by the Miracle on which anguish and victory both are based!

And, once more, fourthly, observe the POSITIVE INSTITUTIONS which are gradually being erected in the world on this same wonderful corner-stone, the Incarnation of God in Jesus: the great structures of piety, philanthropy, law, which through the ages are rising from it; the immense and majestic Civil-

ization, whose lower courses are laid already upon its rock, whose head-stones and pinnacles future years shall complete.

These all have, of course, their human aspect, as well as their Divine. They are not simply revealed by God—like the system of Truth, or that of Salvation—and presented in their immortal brightness, to challenge the faith and the homage of mankind. They are ordained in their principles, and general laws; and then are left to be realized, in their details, by the new but incomplete life in the soul, through the strenuous thought and effort of Christians, and amid the manifold pressures which limit them from an unbelieving and hostile world. They are therefore marked, in their concrete exhibition, by man's imperfection, and defaced oftentimes by the traces of error. They are glorious, chiefly, in their significance; for the prophecies which they already contain of what at last shall be accomplished. But still how novel and wonderful they are! how illustrative of that divinest force which has come into history! how proportioned in their scheme, if not yet in its fulfilment, to the august fact on which they are based!

The Church of Christ:—it is not what Romish apologists make it; what some among Protestants, not emancipated yet from the dream of the Jews who sought a terrestrial kingdom of Messiah, wish that it might be—a vast, world-embracing, magnificent organism, enriched with wealth, enthroned in power, amazing the senses with the splendor of its spectacles, enchainning the reason with authoritative dogmas, and dispersing the grace which is lodged in its hierarchy, and transmitted by their touch, on the sacraments of its priests. Not such is the Church which was built at the beginning, and which still continues, on the marvellous base of the Incarnation. An institution of that kind, set side by side with the Sermon on the Mount, contrasts it as a despotism contrasts maxims of liberty; as a prison, or a battle-ship, the sweet rule of forgiveness. So far as such a "Church" has been erected on the earth, it has proved in history, what it had been foreseen that it would be, a later institution, constructed by man's ambition and pride, and founded on that idea of empire with which the very soil of Rome seemed instinct.



But the true Church of Christ:—look back to it at its first appearance, in Antioch or Corinth, or in the house of Philemon at Colossæ, and how wonderful it is ! how wholly separate from any thing that had preceded it in the world ! how full of a peculiar life, which gives it the promise of continuance among men, till the earth itself has been dissolved !

It is not a casual association of men, confederated for the time by a common belief, a common aim, and destined again to fall apart when the belief has been changed or made general, and the aim has been either realized or relinquished. It is founded on the certainty that God has revealed himself to mankind, in the person of his Son ; that he who was born in Bethlehem of Judea is the Divine lord and head of the race; that all who accept him as such, with love, are therefore brethren; and that he is present in their assemblies, wherever they associate in his name. Though simple in its forms, therefore, flexible in its rules, hardly recognized by the world, and with officers for service, not for government, with no treasure but of truth, and no prize but of martyrdom, it is sublime in its spiritual import; transcending, in its nature, all other institutions of the land and of the time.

It is limited to no class; but the rich and the poor, for the first time in history, come together in it, for song and sacrament, and a mutual service; the unlearned and the cultured are one in its fellowship; the master and the slave sit side by side. It is limited to no nation; but Athenian and Thracian, Macedonian, Syrian, Roman, Egyptian, Parthian, Jew, are all citizens in it, and neither has rights beyond the rest. Its law is a law of love, not of force. Its authority is moral, not magisterial. Its home is wherever the fury of men may compel it to hide. But the Lord is its head. The Spirit, who ever manifests him since his ascension, abides within it. And to be cast out from its sweet fellowship, involves a curse which Nero might covet—but in vain—the power to inflict. It is limited to no region; nor to any one century. From city to city it propagates itself. Through the empire it extends; noiseless in its spread, quickening in its power; divided by the sword, only to be multiplied; sheltering its growth in the

shadow of despotism, continuing still while that decays.

No outward events affect its existence. The apostles, one by one, pass away: the Church lives on. Great teachers and preachers arise and work, through many lands, and then are not: the Church remains. One language disappears from use, and others become mere languages of letters: but the Church learns others, and is not for an hour interrupted in its life. The Empire falls, in flaming ruin—the trophies of twelve hundred years crashing together in smoking heaps, above which rise barbarian shouts, with wails of woe that fill the heavens. The Church is not smitten by that destruction. It teaches the savage barbarian its truth, and is seen, like its Lord, walking unscathed amid the furnace, speaking the words of holy cheer to them that suffer. It is corrupted; but again it renews its life from Christ, and becomes, as of old, his faithful witness. A new era begins in human affairs; it is not thereby superseded. It makes the recent arts its ministers, the more powerful machineries its facile instruments. It rides abroad on the wheels of new letters, scatters its seeds in the furrows of revolution, and incorporates other races in itself. When the time for that has come, it crosses the seas, in the track of the discoverer; it plants its standards upon new continents, and makes the furthest islands its home as truly as was Antioch, or the plain of Philippi. And it is around us here, to-day, as vital in itself, and as closely conformed to its primitive model, as if but eighteen years had passed, not eighteen centuries, since first it appeared.

Resting forever on the lordship of Christ, established in him as a brotherhood of believers, simple as the home is, yet more impressive in its simplicity than in all the glitter and complex apparatus of Roman pomp—the Church abides; immovable as mountains; not afraid of decay; watching the rise and change of states; waiting the development and the glory it shall have, as speeding years bring in millenium. It abides, while all things pass. It shall abide, while the earth continues; because founded on the fact that in him from whose life and death it springs, God was incarnate. The moment you take that fact from beneath it, it becomes a mere transient and

shifting society, of men associated for their moral improvement. You may surround it with conveniences afterward, enrich it with arts, house it in marble, put eloquence on its platforms, and culture in its pews; but its sacraments no more have meaning; a present Christ, revealed by the Spirit, is no longer its glory; its very songs want inspiration; and it vanishes ere long, as the snow-flake whose crystals are loosened into drops at the touch of the sun. But while the fact of the Incarnation continues its base, the Church is the most indestructible thing that appears on the earth. The life of God, revealed through his Son, makes its life perennial. It can not fail, till the earth is dissolved, or living souls have ceased upon it.

Yet the Church is but one of the institutions, although the first and chiefest of them, which rest upon this corner-stone. On the vast area supported by it, is room for many. The institutes of charity, of public culture, of ameliorated laws, of liberalized and enlightening governments, stand there side by side. All beneficent institutions, by which the New Age is set apart from the Old, derive strength and permanence from this supreme fact,—that the birth of Jesus was a true Incarnation.

Whether consciously or not, literature takes from this its new temper; society its more cheerful charm; and even science its fresh inspiration. The influence of it works abroad, with ever enlarging range of power, through all the manifested life of the race. Not only are slaveries broken, in consequence; despotisms unloosed; punishments made moral, and no longer brutal; philanthropies expanded. Democracy is founded on that inherent dignity in man's nature which is shown to belong to it, since the Lord has deigned to take it on himself. Republican institutions have in this their legitimate and solid condition, and gain from it a permanence impossible before. Childhood is more honored, and Womanhood has a new grace and renown, since the maiden-mother gave birth to Christ. The imagination of the world, as well as its heart, is quickened by this miracle. Poetry becomes charged, as it meditates upon it, with grander meanings. Art leaps to utter a

loftier thought. The canvass brightens with the spiritual splendor of a new inspiration, as it pictures the form of him of Nazareth. Music is invoked to celebrate his name, and is transfigured in the office. Great temples spring, aspiring like exhalations, solid as hills, to be themselves an incorporate praise to him whom the earth which they rest on once held, whom the heavens which they point to now enthrone.

The old hopelessness has departed; the estrangement from God; the icy darkness of long eclipse, in which the race wandered and moaned, despairing and destroying, finding truth a mirage, and sanctity a myth, consecration impossible, and suicide a good. And henceforth there is courage, a buoyant expectation, a vital, fore-seeing, conquering spirit, over spreading the earth like the spring-tide itself. Where the ancients looked back to the beginning of time as the golden age, since God has been revealed in Jesus, we look forward to the future, as the time of perfected light and peace. No development of progress but seems natural, now. No combat so deadly, but the Christian anticipates in its result the triumph of good. And sometimes the critical points in history seemed touched already with a dawn-light from above. The sounds of an industry more various and rewarding, the discussions of statesmen more wise and humane, the diplomacies that curb war, and the commerce that knits nations into inter-dependence, bring with them all preluding murmurs, prophetic of the songs of peace universal.

Civilization itself, the new Civilization, is thus founded upon the corner-stone which was laid in the Incarnation of God, in the person of Jesus. And though, as yet, this Civilization is only like the Temple walls, hardly lifted above the surface of the valley—where columns and capitals do not appear, where the beautiful gates are not yet set, and where battlements and roof are still to be drawn from the distant quarries where they sleep—yet we can see enough, already, to show us what it shall be in its time; when the prayer, and toil, and heroic endurance, of all Christian centuries, have come to fruition, and a perfect society puts the crown on the earth: at once a fortress, a palace, and a temple; in which all races shall

be kindred; in which all beauty shall surround them; in which the God made manifest in Jesus shall be the Universal King! The age which sees that structure finished, shall see the work of Christ accomplished; shall see the fulfilment of ancient prophecy—the head-stone, at last, brought forth with shoutings of ‘Grace unto it’!

Is it not, then, apparent, that vast and amazing as is the premise with which the religion God has given us starts, the subsequent structures of truth and of grace, erected upon it, are still commensurate with itself? They match it in their majesty, their mystery, and their glory. Of the system of Truth revealed in the Gospel; of the system of Salvation, there brought to exhibition; of the peculiar system of Experience contemplated there, and shown as realized in believers; of the positive Institutions established upon the fact, in the Church that springs from it, and in the new and prophetic Civilization of which it is the base—of all these, is it not plainly true that according to the corner so is the structure, and that only harmonious with the majesty of this is the edifice solidly planted upon it?

Herein is, then, the primordial truth, in which he who holds it will find suggestions of all things else that he needs to know, of all for which he may properly hope; which, if he denies it, will carry down with it, in inevitable consequence, all else that is transcendent in the Gospel, and in the culture and hope of the world. Blessed be God, that this is declared to us—not a dream, but a fact, not a theory or fancy, but the most substantial reality of time—by prophets, who saw it in God’s plan before it was actual; by apostles afterward, recording what they saw, and sealing their witness with their blood! Blessed be God, that the world, which has lost so much that was precious, has never lost the remembrance of this, but clasps it still with a widening faith, and dates from it the brightening years! Blessed be God, my friends and brothers, that to you it is given, as it has been aforetime to others, so many, to proclaim the religion which is founded upon it, and which in all parts is so august—so illustrative of God, so ennobling to man!

Immense is the power with which are clothed the hands that carry the tidings of it! The great "Churches," so called, the vast establishments of hierarchial prerogative and priestly pretense—which have desolated the earth wherever they have ruled it; which have fought one another, with mutual anathemas, till the very air seemed hissing with hate and black with curses; which have wrested the Gospel from the hands that had clasped it, and have done to his disciples, a million times over, what the Jews did to Jesus; which have made the finest peoples of the earth, on its fairest scenes, so corrupt that description hardly can paint them, and so passionately infidel that truth itself can scarcely reach them—even these have found their power, in great part, in the fact that they have presented the Incarnation as the primary principle in their colossal organizations; and that from it they have claimed to derive the virtue which they afterward have asserted—without witness from experience, without warrant from Christ—to be distributed on their sacraments. Except for the appeal which thus they have made, through their hold on this sublimest of facts, to the imagination and heart of mankind, the revolt of reason, and the terrible upburst of the instinct of justice, would long since have dethroned them, where still they have power; as they have made them hateful to the best part of Christendom; as they are unloosing their mighty bands, where yet they reign.

But to us it is given to set forth the system whose solemn and stupendous corner is in this fact of Incarnation, without the iniquitous later inventions by which such establishments have turned it to a means of their secular aggrandizement, and made it the instrument of despotic ambitions. The Gospel to us—as unfolded in the writings through which the Divine Mind teaches the human, and as now interpreted by the Spirit who gave it, to the soul suffused with his grace and light—is "all glorious within;" and from the fulness of its supreme Lord it sheds inspiration to all that is noblest on those whom it reaches. It is not a theory, of morals, or of theology. It is not an evanescent variety, among equal religions. It is the one Religion of the world; the primitive, the ultimate, and to



be the universal; because it rests on the one Incarnation, and the glory of God, revealed in his Son, dwells in it ever. In all the grandeur which it derives, and all the authority which it draws, from that supreme fact, it is ours to proclaim it; setting forth, in discourses, its principles and laws; revealing its spirit, in our renewed character; walking ourselves in the brightness of it; and making the glory of him who is its Head more apparent to men, through praising lips and a consecrated life, than it ever has been by statues or pictures.

How great an office! How mighty, and how far-reaching a work! What impulses of the Spirit press us toward it! What a call to enter it comes from the Lord, revealing himself in vision to us, and waiting for the world to be ready for his reign! No human authority can empower us here, and none can hinder; for service to him becomes, as we think of him, the necessity of our life! No despicable hands, of gluttonous, miserly, profligate prelates—no hands that are dripping with kindred blood, as those of pontiffs have sometimes been—are laid on our heads. No dainty hands, of mitred men, are to us mediators of this Divine grace. We seek, and receive, no superfluous benedictions from those who take titles which Christ disallowed, and who follow most faithfully the erring apostle who would not have others cast out devils. More direct, more imperative, is the summons we answer; and better than this is our 'succession'—of souls inspired by that one light which all along the ages has shined, from the face of him who was fairer than men!

We think of him, in his meekness and his majesty, girded with power, and yet for us transfixed with pains, agonizing alone beneath the olive trees, submitting to the torture and gloom of the cross, and then ascending from the earth in a glory that leaves it more radiant forever—we stand in tender and breathless amaze before his wisdom, grace, and power, and feel Divinity touching us in him, and yet hear him calling us his brethren—and whatever would thrust itself between him and our minds becomes worse than an impertinence! We do not need, we will not have, ringed fingers and ruffled wrists professing to drop His grace upon us! We stand already in

the line of apostles, as we meditate on and testify of him. We reach back and touch hands with all the holy, who have loved and honored this one Divine Lord; with those who died for him—burned, or starved, or buried alive—but who would not deny him; with Perpetua in her prison, and with Polycarp at his stake; yea, back of them,—with all who saw him before he came; who saw in the sacrifice his atonement, in the law-giver his prophet, and in the king but his fore-runner. Illustrious, indeed, have been his servants; a multitude uncounted; a ‘cloud of witnesses’! And a baptism from the power and fire of their spirit should fall on us in our work! No power we have, but they impel us to consecrate to this! No culture we can gather, but here is the use whereby to exalt it! No energy of mind, no grasp of will, no insight of reason, and no uplift of faith, but all are needed, and all are ennobled, in setting forth HIM, who humbled himself beneath the angels, that he might make us their instructors; who could wither the fig-tree by a breath from his lips, and before whose glance assailants fell in sudden awe, and yet who submitted for our salvation to Cross and Tomb; who bent to the ‘acanthine crown’ the head on which are many diadems, that his pangs might exalt us as his miracles could not; and who, though now withdrawn from our sight, still watches our work, and with his pierced and kingly hands has ‘lifted empires off their hinges, and turned to new channels the stream of centuries.’

Wherever we accomplish this grandest office, in our own land, or in others—teaching in the tongue into which we were born, or in those which our zeal impels us to master—he still is with us; no act unseen, no word unheard, by him to whom it offers tribute. And as we make his glory felt, we lift the levels of human welfare. We open to men all wonders and splendors that are hid in his person, or promised through him. We make the eternal wisdom known, which has in him its highest expression. We set men forward, toward that supreme view of him which shall make the immortal brightness of heaven.

God grant us grace to recognize as we ought the greatness of our mission, and to fulfil it, while life remains, with an un-

faltering faith and zeal! that when he comes again, for Judgment, who came of old a wayfaring man, we may be found at his right hand! that when he rules, as rule he will, from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth, we each may have part in that great triumph! And unto God, revealed in Jesus, be now and ever all the praise! Amen.

---

ART. VII.—MR. MILL AND HIS CRITICS.\*

By FRANCIS BOWEN, Professor in Harvard University.

Indirectly, Mr. Mill's "Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy" has been of great service to metaphysical science. It has stimulated inquiry and discussion, and given a fresh interest to the investigation of old problems. Through the cloud of replies, examinations, and criticisms which it has evoked, it has even contributed largely to the establishment of sound doctrine. After all, Mr. Mill's book was not more an attempted refutation of Sir W. Hamilton's philosophy, than an exposition and defense of his own system of metaphysics. He thus gained a slight advantage in the outset; since the philosophy which he attacked was made responsible, by implication at least, for any errors or defects discoverable in his adversary's statement of it; while his own system was apparently strengthened by every such exposure of the seeming weakness of its rival. But an advantage of this sort is soon lost; Sir W. Hamilton's part in the controversy is fast slipping out of notice, and Mr. Mill's own system has become the target against which most of the shots are now directed. In the first edition

---

\*1. The Philosophy of the Conditioned, comprising some Remarks on Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, and on Mr. J. S. Mill's Examination of that Philosophy. By H. L. Mansel, B. D.

2. An Examination of Mr. John Stuart Mill's Doctrine of Causation in relation to Moral Freedom. By Patrick P. Alexander, M. A.

3. The Battle of the Two Philosophies. By an Inquirer.

4. An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy, being a Defense of Fundamental Truth. By James McCosh, D. D.

5. Moral Causation, or Notes on Mr. Mill's Notes to the Chapter on Freedom in the Third Edition of his Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy. By Patrick P. Alexander, M. A.

6. Letters to J. Stuart Mill, M. P., on Causation. By Rowland G. Hazard, of Peacedale, R. I. [Privately printed.]

of his book, he appeared as an assailant; in the third, he stands on the defensive against a host of opponents.

As a critic, Mr. Mill is disposed to be just and candid. We can not call him generous; for he ought, before frequently charging his opponent with inconsistency and self-contradiction, to have kept more constantly in view what indeed he has stated in the first chapter of his book, that Sir W. Hamilton's system was given to the world only in fragments, at long intervals, during the last twenty-seven years of a busy life; and that his "Lectures," the only approach to a consecutive exposition of it, were a posthumous publication of what was probably never intended by him for any other use than as manuscript notes, though they were printed nearly as they were first written by him some twenty years before his death. Extracts from these Lectures, written in 1836, ought not to have been compared, so frequently to his disadvantage, with statements of his more matured opinions made in his edition of Reid in 1846, or in his "Discussions," which passed to a second edition in 1853. Hamilton was eminently a progressive student and a candid and independent thinker, who never dreaded the imputation of a change of opinion, or shrank from modifying a statement which appeared to his calmer thought ill-judged or excessive. His philosophy can be fairly estimated only from his own latest published exposition of it, the second edition of his "Discussions;" or, if these are compared with his edition of Reid, it should be, not for the purpose of charging him with inconsistent opinions or incoherent thought, but to show the gradual development of his doctrines in his own mind. For his Lectures, we are persuaded that, during the last ten years of his life, he would have declined to consider himself as at all responsible, since they were hurriedly written at the outset, each Lecture, as the Editors tell us, being "usually written on the day, or more properly, on the evening and night, preceding its delivery;" "they never were revised by him with any view to publication;" and the manuscripts probably were not destroyed only because "he intended to make some use of portions of them, which had not been incorporated in his other writings, in the promised 'Supplementary Dissertations to Reid's

Works." Mr. Mill himself observes, "one of the unfairest, though commonest, tricks of controversy is that of directing the attack exclusively against the first crude form of a doctrine." We do not believe Mr. Mill ever consciously violated this sound principle; but if he had always remembered it, he would have withdrawn, or essentially modified, several passages in the third and eighth chapters of his book. No fair opponent will now hold him responsible for those statements in his first edition, which he has silently altered, or avowedly abandoned, in the third.

It is curious that neither Mr. Mill nor any of his critics seems to have been aware, that "the Philosophy of the Conditioned" was Hamilton's only by adoption, since it is at least two centuries old, having been set forth in all its essential features, even in the theological application which Mr. Mansel has made of it, by Pascal. Hamilton could not have been ignorant of this fact, since Pascal was one of his favorite authors, and he frequently borrows from the *Pensées* arguments and illustrations either of the theory itself, or which stand in close juxtaposition with passages in which the theory is explicitly set forth. He probably regarded his obligations to that marvellous child of genius as so obvious as not to need mention. The fact is of some importance, since Mr. Mill openly attributes the paralogisms into which he thinks Hamilton was betrayed, in attempting to prove that the Infinite and the Infinitely Divisible are both inconceivable, to his ignorance of mathematics. Now these "puzzles concerning infinity" are, to a considerable extent, directly borrowed from Pascal, who was certainly the greatest mathematical genius of his age.

"It is a weakness natural to man," argues Pascal, "to believe that he possesses the truth directly; hence it happens that he is always disposed to deny every thing which is incomprehensible to him; whereas, in fact, he is naturally conversant only with falsehood, and he ought to accept as true only those propositions of which the contradictory seems to be false. This is why we ought always, when a proposition is inconceivable, to suspend our judgment concerning it, and not to deny it on this account, but examine its contradictory; and if we find this is necessarily false, we may boldly affirm the former one, inconceivable as it is. Let us apply this rule to our subject."

"There is no mathematician who does not believe that space is infinitely divisible; and yet there is no one who comprehends an infinite division. We

comprehend perfectly well, that by dividing a given extension ever so many times, we can never arrive at a portion of it which is indivisible—that is, which has no extension. For what is more absurd than to maintain that, when a portion of space is divided, its two halves should remain indivisible and without any extension, so that these two nothings of extension, when taken together, should constitute an extension? For I would ask those who think they have this idea, whether they conceive clearly that the two indivisibles touch each other; if they touch throughout, then they constitute only one and the same thing, and yet the two together are indivisible; if not throughout, then they touch only in part; then they have parts; then they are not indivisible."

"Let them confess, then, as in truth they do when they are pressed, that *their* proposition, [that space is not infinitely divisible,] is just as inconceivable as *the other*. [that space is infinitely divisible;] and let them acknowledge that it is not by our capacity of conceiving things, that we ought to judge of their truth; since the two contraries [contradictories] being both inconceivable, it is still absolutely certain that one of them is true."

In like manner, he argues:

"However great a number may be, we may always conceive a greater one, and then one which is greater than this last, and so on to infinity, without ever arriving at one which can not be any farther augmented. And, on the contrary, however small a number may be, as the hundredth or ten thousandth part, we may always conceive a smaller one, and so on to infinity, without arriving at zero or nothing."

"In a word, for any movement, any number, any space, and any time whatsoever, there is always a greater and a less; so that they are all sustained between nothing and infinity, being always *infinitely* remote from these extremes."

"All these truths can not be demonstrated; and yet they are the very foundations and principles of mathematics. But as the reason which makes them incapable of demonstration is not their obscurity, but their extreme evidence, this want of proof is not a fault, but rather a perfection."

"Those who see clearly these truths, will be able to admire the grandeur and the power of nature, in this double infinity which surrounds us on all hands, and learn from this marvellous consideration to know themselves, by regarding themselves as placed between an infinity and a nothing of extension, between an infinity and a nothing of number, between an infinity and a nothing of motion, between an infinity and a nothing of time; and thereby one may learn to estimate himself at his true value, and form reflexions which are worth more even than all the rest of mathematics."

"For, in fine, what is man in nature? A nothing in regard to the infinite, an all in regard to nothing, a middle term betwixt nothing and all. Infinitely removed from comprehending the extremes, the end of things and their beginning are, for him, veiled forever in impenetrable secrecy; and he is equally incapable of seeing the nothingness whence he was drawn and the infinite in which he is engulfed."

"Unity added to infinity does not at all augment it, any more than a foot increases an infinite measure. The finite is annihilated in presence of the in-



finite, and becomes a pure nothing. So is it with our spirit before God; so with our justice before the Divine justice. There is not so great a disproportion between unity and infinity, as between our justice and that of God."

"We know *that* there is an infinite, and we are ignorant of its nature, since we know it is not true that numbers are finite; then we know that there is an infinite in number, but we know not *what* it is. It is neither odd nor even, for adding unity to it does not change its nature. And yet it is a number, and every number is either odd or even."

"Thus we may well know *that* there is a God, without knowing *what* he is."

"Think you it is impossible that God should be infinite, and yet without parts? But I will show you a thing which is both infinite and indivisible; it is a point moving in all directions with an infinite swiftness; for it is in all places, and it is all in each place."\*

There can not be a more distinct and forcible exposition of the Philosophy of the Conditioned than is presented in these eloquent fragments. Mr. Mill only skirmishes on the outskirts of the subject, when he makes an elaborate attempt to prove, that Hamilton's discussion of it confounds three distinct meanings of the word *conception*; we can hardly believe that he is serious in thus raising a dust which only obscures the question. And a similar doubt, whether he is in earnest, will intrude, when we find him gravely affirming that "we can not conceive two and two as five, because an *inseparable association* compels us to conceive it as four;" and that we can not conceive two straight lines, as enclosing a space, because "the mental image of two straight lines which have once met, is *inseparably associated* with the representation of them as diverging." It is rather hard to believe that a mathematician has no better reason for affirming either of these truths, than a French rustic has for persistently calling a cabbage a *chou*, or an English peasant for invariably denominating it a *cabbage*. The etymology of the word *con-cipio*, indicates clearly enough, that to *conceive* means to grasp together attributes in a unity of representation before the mind,—that is, to individualize them by an act of imagination. Of course, the attempt to do this must fail, either when there are no attributes, except negative ones, to be grasped together, as is the case with the Infinite, or with pure

---

\* *Pensées*. Edition Faugère. Vol. I. pp. 139, 136, 137, 147. Vol. II. pp. 66, 163-5, 170.

Being (*Seyn ist nichts*); or when the elements thus brought into juxtaposition absolutely refuse to coalesce into a single image, as in the case of a round square. So, also, images of an enclosed space and of two straight lines, or of two and two and of five, will not flow into one; and this incapacity of union is just as obvious the first time we form distinct images of them as the last, the frequency of making the trial having nothing to do with the firmness of our conviction that the result can not be attained. Yet Mr. Mill maintains, that "we should probably have no difficulty in putting together the two ideas supposed to be incompatible, if *our experience* had not first inseparably associated one of them with the contradictory of the other;" that is, the only reason why we can not believe that two and two are five, is that we have been uniformly *accustomed* to think that they are four! Surely this is empiricism run mad, since it is more than the stoutest advocate of the doctrine, that all our knowledge of real things is derived from experience, needs to affirm. Experience itself is only an aggregate of intuitions; and if any one of these, taken singly, is not valid, the whole must be worthless. If a single intuition, in imagination, does not convince us that two and two are four—i. e., are not five—then are we incompetent to affirm, on the like basis of a single intuition, that scarlet and crimson are both red—i. e., are not blue or yellow. The compatibility or incompatibility of two given attributes with each other is a universal truth, even a necessary and immutable truth, which is often grasped quite as firmly through a single intuition, as through a multitude of experiments; most of the primary truths of mathematics are of this character. But we can not affirm any attribute generally of a whole class of real entities or existing things—e. g., that all matter is heavy—except on the basis of multiplied experience; and such affirmation remains, at best, only a contingent truth. It is still possible that it should be falsified by further experience.

Mr. Mill admits, that "we are unable to conceive an end to space;" but accounts for this want of power in his usual way, not by any inherent incapacity, but solely by the empirical fact, that "we have never perceived any object, or any portion

of space, which had not other space beyond it. And we have been perceiving objects and portions of space from the moment of birth." Very well; so, also, we have never perceived any particular body, or aggregate of matter, which had not some other body near it. At least, it had near it the ground which it rested on, or the atmosphere in which it floated. Are we therefore unable to conceive a body absolutely isolated,—hanging, for instance, as many conceive the universe to do, in an otherwise void inane? Mr. Mill is the last person who ought to affirm such isolation to be inconceivable; for, as we shall endeavor to show, his own "Psychological Theory of Mind" leaves him, the author of it, just in this state of uncomfortable loneliness, without a being to talk to, or an earth to rest upon, except his own sensations. Of course, Mr. Mill will reject this inference from his theory; since he is not so daringly consistent as his prototypes, Hume and Fichte, by both of whom it is frankly admitted. But he surely will not so far disclaim kindred with them as to assert, that their hypotheses are not only unfounded, but inconceivable. He is but a tyro in metaphysics, who can not so far enter into the scheme of Absolute Idealism or Pantheism, as to be able to conceive The One as existing to the exclusion of all else.

While thus admitting that we can not conceive an end to space, Mr. Mill strives to escape from Hamilton's dilemma, by affirming that our conception of Infinite Space is a real conception; that it "is both real and *perfectly definite*;" that "we possess it *as completely as we possess any of our clearest conceptions*, and can avail ourselves of it as well for ulterior mental operations."<sup>\*</sup> He seems to limit this assertion, indeed, by admitting that the conception is "not adequate;" but this limitation amounts to nothing, in view either of the passage which we have just italicized, or of the assertion which he immediately volunteers, that "we never have an adequate conception of any real thing." But his doctrine, as thus explained, involves him in a worse difficulty than that which he strove to shun. The want of experience, he tells us, is all that pre-

\* Pp. 101, 103. All our references and citations are from the Third Edition of Mr. Mill's work.

vents us from conceiving space as *finite*. Ought not, then, a corresponding want of experience to prevent us from conceiving space as *infinite*? Or does Mr. Mill intend to maintain the not very intelligible proposition, that finite man has had experience of Infinite Space as *Infinite*?

As already remarked, we hold that Infinite Space, like Pure Being, is inconceivable from the first of the two reasons mentioned,—namely, from the want of any attributes, except negative ones, to be grasped together. Mr. Mill says it is conceivable. Will he inform us under what attributes he conceives it, whether as a pyramid, a cube, a sphere, or what other shape? whether as regular or irregular in outline, flexible or stiff, moveable or immoveable, colored or colorless? If it has none of these qualities, but is characterized only by the absence of all of them, will he tell us how a conception of something which has no limits, no shape, no consistence, no mobility, and no color, can still be “perfectly definite,” possessed “as completely as we possess any of our clearest conceptions”? The question is an interesting one, as Mr. Mill is an ultra-Nominalist, thoroughly committed to the doctrine that a “Concept can not exist in the mind except enveloped in the miscellaneous attributes of an individual” (p. 374), that it must be such as to be depicted to sense or imagination, since “the existence of Abstract Ideas—the conception of the class-qualities by themselves, and not as embodied in an individual—is effectually precluded by the law of Inseparable Association.” He does tell us that, in order to conceive Infinite Space, we have to “think away only the idea of an end or a boundary.” Let him then decide how definite a conception he can give of *color* to a congenitally blind person, by informing him that it is *not sound*; or of *sound* to one who has never heard one, by saying that it is *not color*. It is only putting the difficulty in other words, to say that the congenitally blind can not have any definite conception even of the *absence of color*, or the congenitally deaf of the *absence of sound*. Nay, according to Mr. Mill’s own law of Inseparable Association, since all the objects within our experience have an end and a boundary, we can not even conceive of that which has neither.

It is a transparent paralogism to urge, as Mr. Mill does, that we can even have a positive conception of Infinite Space, because we leave to it some positive attributes ;—"we leave to it the character of space ; all that belongs to it as space ; its three dimensions," etc. The only question is, whether we can think Space *as Infinite* ; and this is not answered by predicating certain qualities of Space *as Finite*, since the possession of these does not at all discriminate the Infinite from the Finite, which is the very thing that we are called upon to do. Mr. Mill simply tells us that space is space, whether it is Finite or Infinite ;—which is not very important information in any respect, and not at all to the purpose in our present inquiry. It is not even true, that we leave to the conception of Infinite Space "all that belongs to it as space ;" for space consists of parts, while Infinite Space has no parts. If it had, the addition or abstraction of a *finite* part would increase or diminish infinity, which is impossible ; and the very phrase, an *infinite* part, is a contradiction in terms.

Mr. Mill's farther attempt to characterize this "perfectly definite" conception, that it is "greater than any finite space," simply confounds the infinite with the indefinite; for the question immediately arises, *how much greater* ? If greater only by some finite magnitude, the answer is not true ; if infinitely greater, the answer is a silly truism, for it is summed up in this equation : Infinite Space = X ÷ Infinite Space.

The mathematicians' "infinite" and "infinitesimal" are merely this indefinitely great and indefinitely small,—that is, quantities which may be made as great or as small *as we please*, without affecting the use which we are to make of them. Thus defined, or rather thus left indefinite, the mathematician has a perfect right to speak of an "infinitesimal" of the second or third power,—expressions which Berkeley very properly ridiculed as absurd, when applied to the "infinitely small" strictly so called, which is simply the mathematical "infinitesimal" raised to an infinite power. Perhaps farther examination of that "masterly specimen of analysis," Mr. DeMorgan's attempt to "let the light of reason into all the logical obscurities and paradoxes of the infinitesimal calculus," may lead Mr.

Mill to doubt whether the metaphysical acumen of that writer is quite equal to his acknowledged skill as a mathematician.

Mill's criticism (p. 103) on Hamilton's earlier and crude statement of the Law of the Conditioned is just, but ungenerous; since it takes no notice of the later and matured expression of the same Law, at least in respect to space, in the Appendix to the "Discussions," (2d ed. p. 606.) It is an indistinct, and even an unmeaning, statement, that all positive thought lies between *these* two extremes,—namely, "Space in the aggregate considered as having a limit, and Space in the aggregate considered as having no limit;" for as *these* "extremes" are contradictories, by the Law of Excluded Middle, they have no "mean,"—nothing "lies between" them. The Law of the Conditioned is correctly expressed by Pascal, and by Hamilton in the passage just referred to, his former enunciation of it being a mere oversight of language. All that is conceivable to human thought—namely, the Finite—lies between these two extremes, the infinitely great and the infinitely small, either of which is inconceivable, and yet neither can be rejected, since the contradictory of either is equally inconceivable. Mr. Mill's whole page of triumphant criticism might as well have been directed against an obvious misprint; since the whole course of Hamilton's argument shows, that he always had in mind the later and more correct statement of the doctrine.

We come now to the doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, a doctrine which has been presented under so many forms and in so many degrees, that a full discussion of it would carry us over nearly the whole ground of metaphysics. As understood by Mill, the Relativity seems to be tantamount to the Uncertainty of knowledge, and not merely to a limitation of it to the sphere of phenomena. But we would inquire, whether the existence of the phenomena themselves, as *phenomena*, or as appearances either in our minds, or somewhere else, and as relative to us or to our consciousness, is not certainly, and even absolutely, known? Do we not know them immediately and absolutely,—as they are in themselves, or in their several characteristics, being distinguishable from each other both in quantity and quality, since they have distinct attributes and



qualities? Wherein, then, is the alleged inconsistency between the doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, and that of Real Presentationism, or immediate intuition of the Primary Qualities of body, these Qualities being directly presented to us—that is, being phenomenally *known*—as forms of the Non-Ego?

How do you know that your own sensations exist, or are actual? Why, because we have an *immediate* or *presentative* knowledge of them, as phenomena of our own minds,—that is, as mere subjective affections. But do we therefore have an *absolute* knowledge of them as such? If Mr. Mill says Yes, then he rejects that doctrine of Relativity, which is equivalent to denying the Certainty of our intuitive knowledge of phenomena. If he says No, then there is an *immediate*, which is not an *absolute*, knowledge; and the whole ground for this particular criticism on Hamilton disappears.

But it is urged that the phenomena of sensation and emotion are “perceived or felt as facts that have no reality out of us;” while the phenomena of solidity and extension are “alleged to be perceived as facts whose reality is out of our minds and in the material object.” What of that? Our present question is, not whether these qualities really do exist externally, just in the mode under which they appear or are presented to our minds; but whether they are presented to us as so existing. We are now asking—What these perceptions affirm, and in what manner they affirm it:—and not—Whether they affirm it truly. The phenomena of internal sensation and emotion, such as appetite, pain, and sorrow, appear or manifest themselves as mere subjective affections; the phenomena of external perception, on the other hand, announce themselves through consciousness as modes of the Non-Ego intuitively apprehended;—that is, as a direct and immediate, and not merely a vicarious or representative, knowledge of the qualities of external things. That they manifest themselves in this manner,—the former as subjective, and the latter as objective,—will hardly be denied even by those who affirm such manifestation to be illusive,—a mere *simulacrum*, in the latter case, of outness and objectivity. Neither will it be de-

nied that the apprehension of the subjective and objective modes is equally immediate. When touched or pressed by some foreign substance simultaneously, or in quick succession, on two separate portions of the surface of my body at an appreciable distance from each other,—as on the shoulder and the hip,—I am directly conscious of the difference between *here* and *there*, and thus intuitively apprehend the extension of my own body, and the solidity of the substance in contact with it. Even if I am asleep and only dream of such impressions made upon me, still I do dream of them as such,—namely, as objective and external affections immediately perceived. But my knowledge of them *as objective* is only relative, as I shall find on awaking from the dream. We affirm, then, that the doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge is perfectly reconcilable with that of Natural Realism, or the immediate perception of the Primary Qualities of body.

Mr. Mill vainly puzzles himself over Hamilton's often repeated assertions, that Extension and Solidity are known "*immediately in themselves*," and not merely "*in their effects on us*;" and that they are "*apprehended as they are in bodies*, and not, like the Secondary, as they are in us." Very true! They are *known* or *apprehended* BY US as such, or under that character. Whether they really possess that character, apart from their appearance under the form of it to our minds, is another question. Our present inquiry concerns only the mode of their presentation to our minds, or of their apprehension by our consciousness, and does not even touch the point, how they are apprehended by minds differently constituted—for instance, by the Infinite Mind. Natural Realism, as we understand it, does not necessarily conflict with Berkeleyan Idealism, or with Malebranche's doctrine that we see all things in God; though it certainly deprives those theories of some portion of their plausibility. It does conflict sharply with that dreary form of Idealism—more properly called Egoism, or Nihilism—which leaves a solitary "*thread of consciousness*" alone in the universe, acknowledging no power of efficient causation either in itself or out of

itself, and reducing the universe, in fact, to a mere string of sensations following each other in a fatalistic connection, without beginning, end, or purpose.

The doctrine that the Primary Qualities are apprehended "*immediately in themselves*," and not merely "in their effects on us," will not appear irreconcilable with the assertion, that our knowledge of them is only Relative, to any one who considers the two perfectly distinct meanings of the phrase here italicized.

1. To know a thing *immediately in itself* is to be distinguished from knowing it only through an image or representation of itself; the former is knowing it *per se*, the latter, *per aliud*. An instance of the former is my consciousness of present pain; of the latter, my remembrance of a former pain.

2. To know a thing *immediately in itself* is also to be distinguished from knowing it only as it is in relation to our faculties. The former—if it were a possible cognition, which it is not—would be of the *Ding an sich*, the *noumenon*; the latter is only of the *phenomenon*.

The doctrine of Natural Realism adopts the former of these two meanings; it teaches that the Primary Qualities are known *in themselves immediately*, but *not absolutely*. Mr. Mill fails to distinguish the two, and, through his own confusion of thought, attributes a blunder to the philosopher whom he is criticising. For we maintain that this is not merely a possible interpretation of Hamilton's language, but that it is clearly, and we had almost said unmistakably, his meaning. Witness the two following passages from the *Dissertations Supplementary to Reid* :—

"In the act of sensible perception, I am conscious of two things—of *myself* as the *perceiving subject*, and of an *external reality*, in relation with my sense, as the *object perceived*. Of the existence of both these things I am convinced; because I am conscious of knowing each of them, not mediately in something else, *as represented*, but immediately in itself, *as existing*. Of their mutual independence I am no less convinced, because each is apprehended equally and at once, in the same indivisible energy, the one not preceding or determining, the other not following or determined; and because each is apprehended out of, and in direct contrast to, the other." p. 747.

Here we are told *what* we are conscious of, and *how* the two things are apprehended. Our conviction of *the fact* of

their *actual* existence is rightly stated merely as an inference from this their mode of *manifestation to us*—which inference, of course, though it may be called *knowledge*, is only *relative* knowledge. But that there may be no mistake on this point, Hamilton soon adds this explanation:—

“I have frequently asserted, that in perception we are conscious of the external object immediately and in itself. This is the doctrine of Natural Realism. But in saying that a thing is known in itself, I do not mean that this object is known in its absolute existence, that is, out of relation to us. This is impossible; for our knowledge is only of the relative. *To know a thing in itself or immediately, is an expression I use merely in contrast to the knowledge of a thing in a representation, or mediately.* On this doctrine, an external quality is said to be known in itself, when it is known as the immediate and necessary correlative of an internal quality of which I am conscious. . . . I can not be conscious of myself as the resisted relative, without at the same time being conscious, being immediately percipient, of a not-self as the resisting correlative. In this cognition there is no sensation, no subjective-organic affection. I simply know myself as a force in energy, the not-self as a counter force in energy.” p. 866.

We may well wonder how language so explicit as this could be misunderstood by a philosopher of so much acuteness as Mr. Mill.

The final sentence of this last extract is an admirably clear and simple statement of that fact of consciousness, in which we are assured both of our own existence as exerting force, or putting forth inborn power, and of its correlative, a counter force exerted against us by something which is not ourselves. The most distinct manifestation which we have of Self is this consciousness of the exertion of our own force;—not the mere sensation of muscular strain, for that comes afterwards, and is contingent on the healthy action of the nervous and muscular organism. It is the direct perception of *mental effort* which constitutes what Hamilton calls “the *enorganic* volition;”—not the “*hyperorganic*,” which is merely meditating the act before willing it; nor the “*organic*,” which is only contingent, because it may be frustrated by paralysis of the nerves, and is empiric, since it can be known only after experience. But the *enorganic* is the true *nisus*—the act itself, which is free, because neither external force nor inward temptation can elicit or check it; and, hence, it is this alone for which conscience holds us responsible. Man first becomes fully conscious of himself in this exercise of his free activity;

because mere *thought* is passive, being subject to a law, that of the association of ideas, which is beyond his control. His *will* alone escapes law, mocks at external compulsion, and riots in the sense of its own freedom. The Cartesian axiom understates the truth, and should be modified; not mere thought, but volition, first fully reveals man to himself. When this free volition becomes organic, or is manifested externally through the muscles, it soon encounters resistance from without, or an external force counteracting it; and in this we first cognize the Not-Self, which we call *material*, though the fact that it, too, manifests force, induced Berkeley to consider it as *spiritual*. Hence, the only form of Idealism which escapes the dreary conclusion of Egoism—which does not leave the Idealist alone in the universe—is the Berkeleyan. The Ego finds itself enclosed, and the exercise of its free activity restricted, within the limits of that covering of flesh in which it is, at least in idea, imprisoned; though within these limits, it “spreads undivided, operates unspent,” in every fibre and atom. Through the numerous points of contact and resistance between the internal and the external force which this embodiment supplies, and through its instinctive recognition of the difference between these points as *here* and *there*, Self becomes conscious of the extension of its own body, and hence, at once, of externality and the free space within which this body acts. As immediately apprehended by consciousness, *matter* is known only as a counter force in energy within certain limits of extension; and this spiritualized conception of it physicists themselves, on grounds afforded by their own science, are fast adopting with singular unanimity.

As contrasted with this clear and simple doctrine, Mr. Mill's Psychological Theory of Matter and Mind appears to us, we must confess, an elaborate failure. Misled by “the fatal charms of the goddess Necessity,” to whose pursuit he has adhered with wonderful fidelity, he wanders far afield, and sits down at last hopelessly bewildered, in full view of phenomena, which, as he is obliged to admit, are on his theory entirely inexplicable. “So much the worse for them!” He prefers to leave the facts unexplained, rather than abandon his theory. A

pretty cool admission this, in view of the grave rebuke which he soon administers to Hamilton, by declaring that "he is not entitled to frame a theory from one class of phenomena, extend it to another class which it does not fit, and excuse himself by saying, that if we can not make it fit, it is because ultimate facts are inexplicable." (p. 544.)

Denying any efficient causation, and resolving even the idea of Cause into mere uniformity of sequence, his "groups" of Sensations, and "Permanent Possibilities" of Sensation, remain obstinately subjective, and refuse to assume even a decent semblance of a thinking Self, or of external realities. Each one testifies only to the fact of its own individual existence; and it does even this only in some unexplained and incomprehensible way. Rejecting, also, the idea of Substance, and explaining away our fancied notion of it into a mere Indissoluble Association, formed by long and uninterrupted habit, between certain Sensations always recurring near each other and in a fixed order, even his "groups" have only a factitious unity, and resolve themselves, under the keen eye of the analytical reason, into a mere heap of dry sand without any real cement to bind the particles together. After making these large admissions, and also after being hard pressed by his critics, especially by the Editor of this REVIEW, we are not surprised to find him driven at last to the frank confession, that he does "not believe that the real externality to us of anything, except other minds, is capable of proof." Whether, upon the principles of his own theory, the exception here made is a valid one, is a point for subsequent consideration. Meanwhile it is to be remarked, that the objective reality of Space itself is negatived by denying *outness*, which is its necessary condition. He admits, also, that "he has never pretended to account by association for the idea of Time," as he believes that the facts of simultaneity and succession are all that his theory needs to postulate.

He must be an intrepid reasoner, who still maintains the sufficiency of a method which leads to these disastrously negative results. These are the legitimate consequences of what Mr. Mill calls the "Psychological Method," which attempts to



account for our supposed cognitions of Matter and Mind by resolving both into a mere series of sensations, which is, in some inexplicable manner, conscious of itself as a series, and the various parts of which tend, under the law of the association of ideas, to coalesce into groups. He challenges a comparison of this mode of procedure with the Hamiltonian, which he calls the Introspective Method—though it would be more properly called the Intuitive, since it asserts an immediate or intuitive cognition of both these realities, as original facts of consciousness. As the Psychological Method resolves both Matter and Mind into mere groups of sensations, we are not surprised to find such “metaphysical entities,” or abstractions, as Cause, Power, Substance, Externality, Time, and Space, disappearing along with them; disappearing not only in fact, as unproved, but even in idea; since it is maintained that we have no distinct conception of what these words denote.

Now, it is only under these very forms and abstractions—if we may not call them “entities”—as invested with them and manifested through them, that both the Self and the Not-Self are presented to consciousness. And the Psychological Theory has to explain the origin of these seemingly intuitive cognitions *as thus presented*, in all their characteristics; not only in their most naked and abstract form, as merely contradistinguished from each other; but as conditioned and limited by Time and Space, as acting and reacting upon each other by their Causal efficiency, and marked off, so to speak, into two distinct realms of consciousness by belonging, apparently, the one to an inner, and the other to an outer, world. Mr. Mill adopts as his criterion of truth, not the testimony of consciousness, however seemingly immediate and primitive, but the greater or less plausibility of any theory which may be framed respecting the manner in which consciousness was first induced to put on this illusive semblance of immediateness and originality. He thus denies that we can know by intuition whether any cognition is or is not intuitive; which is only a roundabout mode of denying that any truth or fact can be intuitively known. He makes reasoning the test of intuitions, instead of intuitions being the test of reasoning. We main-

tain that intuitions can be at once cognized as such—that is, can be immediately distinguished from empirical and derivative truths or facts—by these two marks or tests:—1, by their character of necessity, their contradictory being inconceivable or unimaginable; or 2, by their being necessary elements of experience, so that, without them, experience itself would not be possible. Let us apply both these criteria.

I. We maintain that Extension or Space is made known to us by direct intuition, in the manner just explained, by distinguishing *here* from *there* on the surface of our own bodies. We say this cognition is intuitive, both because it presents itself as such to our consciousness—that is, as immediate, since we certainly are not conscious of deriving it, either by inference or by composition, from antecedent cognitions; and because it possesses the first of the two criteria just mentioned, viz., necessity; for when we have once conceived and affirmed the existence of Space, we find ourselves utterly unable to conceive its destruction, or imagine its non-existence. We can with the utmost ease imagine not only the disappearance, but the annihilation, of all the material objects now occupying a given portion of space; but this space once so occupied utterly refuses to be reduced to a nonentity, even in imagination. To take an instance more pertinent to our discussion with Mr. Mill;—though a lifelong association, an experience repeated every instant of my whole life, connects *me* with my own *body*—that body a suggestion from which furnished the occasion on which the idea of space first rose into my mind—I can with ease imagine the dissolution, and even the annihilation, of every particle of my body. But even the smallest portion of the space now occupied by this body flatly refuses to be annihilated, even in idea. The parts of space, then, present themselves to intuition as necessarily indestructible; as external, not only to the perceiving mind, but to each other (*partes extra partes*); as immoveable, and so inseparable from each other; and as a condition of the existence of matter. Am I asked, on what authority it is affirmed that space possesses all these properties? The answer is plain; on the authority of Intuition. If he considers the subject for a moment, every

person's consciousness will assure him, that he conceives space as possessing every one of these attributes.

Thus, then, the Intuitionist or Introspective Theory accounts for the genesis of the idea of space, with all the characteristics now enumerated. On occasion of a trivial and oft-repeated experience—the casual contact of some foreign substance with two distinct portions of my body, the idea spontaneously rises in my mind, and subsequent reflection assures me that it possesses each of these attributes. How does Mr. Mill solve the same problem on the principles of his Psychological Theory? It is difficult to consider the points of his answer with gravity, or believe that he is serious in propounding it.

Remember that he has no material to work with but present and remembered Sensations, occurring either singly or in groups; the action of Association in binding the members of these groups firmly together, even causing them at times to coalesce into one; and Expectation, under given circumstances, of the recurrence of similar groups, thus forming what he calls "Permanent Possibilities of Sensation." Our whole knowledge of these Sensations and groups, whether in their simple state, or as modified by Association and Expectation, is limited to their coexistences and sequences, and their similitudes. What chemistry will enable Mr. Mill to transmute any one, or any combination, of such materials into the idea of indestructible, external, immoveable, eternal, and infinite Space?

Recapitulating his theory, he says (p. 274): "The sensation of muscular motion unimpeded constitutes our notion of empty space, and the sensation of muscular motion impeded constitutes that of filled space. Space is Room—room for movement." And, in further explanation of his theory, he affirms (p. 276): "that the idea of Space is, at bottom, one of Time—and that the notion of extension or distance, is that of a motion of the muscles continued for a longer or shorter duration."

The objections to this theory are numerous and patent.

1. Before we have the ideas either of *outness* or of *space*, how do we know that *motion* takes place, or even what *motion* is? The only possible conception of motion is that of trans-

ference from one part of space to another; and it is therefore inconceivable, unless we already know what space is. An idea can not beget itself.

2. As, on this theory, we only know the Sensations and the order of their occurrence, how can we know that certain Sensations are caused or produced by motion? Mr. Mill rejects the notion of efficient, or real, *cause* altogether, substituting that of *invariable antecedent*. Then we must first have an antecedent sensation of motion, and know it as such, before we can know the consequent sensation to be one of motion. Then, again, the child is supposed to be its own parent.

3. If, before having the idea of space, I can know that certain sensations are caused by motion, then, since a knowledge of motion presupposes a knowledge of the *locus a quo* and the *locus ad quem*, I must certainly be able, antecedently to experience, to localize sensations in my own body as *here* or *there*; which Mr. Mill vehemently denies, since admitting such a power would be admitting the truth of the opposite theory.

4. If "the idea of space is at bottom one of time," and if, "when we say that the space is greater or less, we mean that the series of sensations (amount of muscular effort being given) is longer or shorter," (p. 273,) then the sensations produced by merely supporting continuously, for some time, with great muscular exertion, a considerable weight, though I stand stock still while so doing, ought to give the ideas both of motion and of space equal in extent to the duration of the effort. Here are all the elements necessary, according to Mill, for the genesis of the two ideas; yet neither idea is generated.

5. Consecutive points regarded as existing simultaneously—that is, *before* and *after*, as elements of *extensive* length—are rightly held to generate, or rather to constitute, the idea, not merely of succession, but of space. (p. 272.) But a succession of events, one passing away when the next follows,—that is, *before* and *after* as elements of *protensive* length—is regarded as giving us an idea only of succession, not of time. Mill seems to reject altogether (p. 247, and *Note*) the objective conception of "an entity called Time, and regarded as not a succession of successions, but as something *in* which the

successions take place." Then, the one kind of succession (simultaneous) does give us the idea of Space, but the other kind (protensive) does not give us the idea of Time; and yet "the idea of Space is at bottom one of Time," and, only by the duration of the effort, do we become conscious of the extent of Space. How, then, does he measure "duration," or what means "duration," except existence continued in Time?

6. Why should the idea of Space, even if constructed as Mr. Mill would have it to be, be that of an *external* and *indestructible* entity, existing independently of our conceptions, when all its elements are internal and contingent? True, he does not believe in the *externality*; or rather, he believes it is not "capable of proof." But he must admit that we have an idea of it; and he is bound to show how this idea was generated.

It does not appear, then, that "The Battle of the Two Philosophies," in regard to the idea of Space, has terminated in a victory for Mr. Mill.

II. As an example for the application of the second criterion of an intuitive truth known as such,—that of being a necessary condition of experience, so that, without it, experience would not be possible,—take the direct cognition by the thinking subject of *himself* as exerting force. Here we are sorry to part company with Hamilton, Reid, and Stewart, though Mr. Mansel is on our side. We maintain, with the last named, that in every act of consciousness, but especially in that of volition, we are directly conscious, not only of the action, but of the agent; not only of the force exerted, but of Self as exerting force. The action could not be known at the moment to be mine, as it unquestionably is, if one and the same act of mind did not cognize both the Ego and the effort. I could not know *hunger*, if I did not, at the same moment, know *Self* as feeling the hunger; for knowledge is a relation between the Subject, or the Self-knowing, and the object known; and even Mr. Mill admits (p. 375) that assuredly a relation can not "be thought without thinking the related objects between which it exists." In the case of Matter, reasoning from the *attributes* to the *substance* is a proper inference, that being inferred which is not directly known or perceived. But in the case of Mind,

we pass from *actions* to the *agent*, which is no inference at all, but a mere descent from an abstraction to a reality,—the object of immediate knowledge being, not the act, but the person acting.

For these reasons, we affirm that Self is an immediate and original presentation of consciousness. Mr. Mill's doctrine is, that Self is only a factitious unit, made up by experience and association out of previous sensations. We apply to this doctrine the second criterion, and maintain that a cognition of Self is a prerequisite or condition of experience, so that, without it, no experience whatever would be possible. Before Mr. Mill can make any use of his psychological chemistry, before he can even apply association to cement his materials together, he must know that these materials exist. His theory postulates Sensations; but it needs to postulate *known* sensations—known either as now existing, or remembered as former objects of knowledge. But any act of knowledge involves a cognition of the subject knowing, as well as of the object known. He admits this fact in another place (258, *Note*), where he says, "*The contrast necessary to all cognition* is sufficiently provided for by the antithesis between the Ego and particular modifications of the Ego." But when arguing (p. 256) to prove that the Ego is not an original presentation of consciousness, he forgets this admission, and denies that a "mere impression on our senses involves, or carries with it, any consciousness of a Self;" and asserts that "our very notion of a Self takes its commencement, there is every reason to suppose, from the *representation* of a sensation *in memory*." Now, it is very easy to believe that we should remember *less*; but how came we to remember *more*, than we originally knew? If the original *presentation* of the sensation did not contain the Ego, how can the *re-presentation* of the same fact contain it? But still worse:—the first "mere impression on our senses," since it does not involve "any consciousness of a Self," is no sensation—no cognition at all; for "the contrast necessary to all cognition" is the antithesis between this very Ego and its particular modifications. Apparently, Mr. Mill thinks he had a sensation before he was born, or even conceived. We say



again, then, that by denying the original presentation of the Ego in consciousness, he has made experience impossible, and thereby burned up all the materials he had to work with, his "Psychological Theory" of Matter and Mind perishing in the same conflagration.

Mr. Mill also denies any "enorganic volition," considered as a conscious putting forth of energy by the thinking subject, either antecedent to, or wholly apart from, the sense of any muscular strain. As a necessary part of his doctrine of Necessity, he does not admit a mental, but only "an animal *nisus*," as Hume calls it, which, Mr. Mill says, "would be more properly termed a conception of effort." He affirms, still more distinctly, that "the idea of Effort is essentially a notion derived from the action of our muscles, or from that combined with affections of our brain and nerves." This doctrine will not appear very probable to any one who has "made an effort" to confine his attention to a dull book; or to banish gloomy thoughts; or to keep down an expression of severe pain; or to call up courage to face danger; or to remember a half-forgotten message; or to repress anger; or to do half a hundred other things, in which mere muscular strain has as little part to play as in working out a formula by the binomial theorem. In fact, this doctrine is so extravagant, that Mr. Mill himself forgets that he has been pushed into affirming it, and informs us, on p. 451, that the formation of a concept "*requires a mental effort*, a concentration of consciousness upon certain definite objects, *which concentration depends on the will*, and is called Attention." And again, on p. 377, he says the consciousness of certain elements of the concrete idea "is faint, in proportion to the energy of the concentrative effort." *Naturam expellas furca*. Mr. Mill's vigorous common sense will show itself in spite of his own theories, when the necessity of defending these theories is not immediately before him.

In another passage (Note to p. 264), the difficulty of maintaining this very untenable doctrine seems to deprive him of his usual precision and caution in the use of language, and in statements of fact. He questions Hamilton's assertion, that

we are conscious of a mental effort, or *nisus*, to move—distinct both from the original determination to move, and from the muscular sensation,—even though stupor of the sensitive nerves, and paralysis of the motive nerves, render both the feeling of the movement, and the movement itself, impossible; and he adds, “If all this is true—though by what experiments it has been substantiated we are not told—it does not by any means show that there is a mental *nisus* not physical, but merely removes the seat of the *nisus* from the nerves to the brain.” “A mental *nisus* not physical!” Will Mr. Mill inform us, what is a mental *nisus* that is physical? The expression seems very like a contradiction in terms, unless he now intends to teach that *all* the so-called “mental” phenomena are really physical, thus adopting one of those “ruder forms of the materialist philosophy,” against which he so vigorously protested in his “Logic,” as pretending to resolve “states of consciousness into states of the nervous system.” He surely does not mean to assert, that a purely mental act, which is antecedent to, and wholly distinct from, any muscular sensation, is accompanied by immediate consciousness of action in the brain. And, if we are not conscious of brain-action in such a case, will he tell us what physiological experiments have proved that, in the case supposed, there is any such action?

The so-called “Psychological Theory” resolves both Matter and Mind into Permanent Possibilities of Sensations. As Mr. Mill says we can not prove either of these possible groups to be really external, or to have any external cause or antecedent, it is not easy to see why one of them should be called Matter, and the other be baptized Mind; or why the two supposed entities, that are thus named, should be so broadly distinguished from each other, as they are in most people’s apprehension of them, when, in fact, they are both made up of the same sort of elements, put together by the same process of mental chemistry. Why should it be even thought that the one is necessarily external, and the other internal? Moreover, we can find a reason why certain sensations should be put into the one group that is called a *material* object,

for they are simultaneous ; at the same moment, I may see the color, smell the odor, taste the savor, and feel the shape and hardness, of the one object which I call an apple. But we find no reason why the other phenomena should be formed into a group at all, since they are not simultaneous, but successive, and often separated from each other by rather long intervals. Why should the phenomena of "knowing, feeling, desiring, etc.," be selected from the countless other manifestations in consciousness, in order to make up the factitious unit called Mind or Self, when they appear in every possible order, sometimes together, sometimes separate, and always more or less jumbled up with external sensations? Some of the modifications of one of them, such as joy, anger, pain, sorrow, love, and the like, may be even of very infrequent occurrence. Why should they be selected as elements of the second group, or of any group, except from a previous or accompanying Intuition, that these alone are States or Modifications of a real unit or entity which I call Myself, and also from an Intuitive apprehension of that difference, which the "Psychological Theory" can not make out or account for,—the difference between *internal* and *external*?

Dic, sapiens Milli, et eris mihi magnus Apollo.

We have not yet half done with Mr. Mill ; but our limits compel us to leave the discussion here for the present, hoping to return to it in the next number of this REVIEW.

#### ART. VIII.—AN "OLD SIDE" PLEA FOR REUNION.

A Sermon by REV. F. ALISON, D. D., 1758.\*

The following discourse was preached before the Synod of Philadelphia, and the Commission of the Synod of New York, on occasion of the reunion of the two bodies in 1758. It is an able and eloquent plea for peace and union among the followers of Christ, and especially among those who accept the Presbyterian standards. The views which it presents, and

\* Preached before the Reverend Synod of Philadelphia, and the Reverend Commission of the Synod of New York, at Philadelphia, May the 24th, 1758, by Francis Alison, D. D., Vice-Provost of the College, and Rector of the Academy in Philadelphia.

the arguments it adduces, are as pertinent and forcible now as they were upon the occasion of its delivery more than a century ago. Indeed, if the learned and pious author could have distinctly foreseen the present circumstances of the Presbyterian church in this country, he could scarcely have used language more appropriate as a Plea for Reunion than that which he here employs. Very few of his expressions would need to be modified, and very little would need to be added. The reader of to-day will find in perusing the discourse, that it takes up successively, and discusses with remarkable ability, many of the very points which are now largely engaging the attention of thoughtful minds. The discourse is valuable, therefore, not only as a memorable production of one of the fathers of the Presbyterian church in this country, which thousands might wish to possess, but as setting forth the grounds on which Christian, and especially Presbyterian, union must rest.

The author, Rev. Francis Alison, D. D., was unquestionably, in some respects, the leading man of the "Old Side." Born in 1705, in Donegal Co., Ireland, subsequently for a time a student of the University of Glasgow, he came to this country in 1735, and after engaging for a short time in teaching, was installed pastor of the New London congregation, Chester Co. Pa. (in May 1737), where he remained for fifteen years.

After the division of 1741, he opened an Academy at the place of his residence. Upon this the Synod's School was engrafted in 1744, and he was appointed principal. The institution became justly celebrated, and quite a number of our distinguished statesmen, signers of the Declaration of Independence, as well as clergymen, were educated in it. In 1752, he removed, with his Academy, to Philadelphia; and when, in 1754, a college was added, he was appointed Vice-Provost and Professor of Moral Philosophy. He was also assistant minister of the First Presbyterian Church. Eminent alike as a preacher and a teacher, he received from the University of Glasgow, in 1758, the title of Doctor of Divinity.

Dr. Alison's views and sympathies were strongly with the

"Old Side." He was one of the signers of the memorable Protest of 1741, which led to the division. But larger experience and calmer reflection led him to take the position which he maintains in this discourse.

Few men of that day commanded more respect for character and ability than Dr. Alison. As a man, a Christian, a scholar, and a preacher, he stood deservedly high. Bishop White, who was a student under him, pronounced him "a man of unquestionable ability in his department, of zeal and rational piety, of liberal mind." Pres. Stiles says of him: "He is the greatest classical scholar in America, especially in Greek—not great in mathematics, philosophy and astronomy, but in ethics, history and general reading, is a great literary character. I have had a long and intimate acquaintance with him." The funeral sermon by Dr. Ewing, pays the tribute of glowing eulogy to his merits. The reader of the following discourse—the only publication of Dr. Alison—will feel that the eulogy was richly deserved.

---

#### PEACE AND UNION RECOMMENDED.

**EPHESIANS IV, 1-7.** I therefore the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called; with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

WHEN our gracious Redeemer first made his appearance among us, the angels of the Lord, with a multitude of the heavenly host, proclaimed "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good-will toward mankind! God is the God of peace, Christ Jesus is the prince of peace; the gospel is the gospel of peace; and to follow peace, and to love one another, is the distinguishing characteristic of his disciples. How strange it is, then, that so many who are called by his name, have so openly and so notoriously failed in this main point, and have paid so little regard to his new commandment.

No men have more heartily hated and despised one another, no men have fought more bitterly, nor been deeper tainted with envy, wrath and malice, than many of those who proclaim themselves his followers. Even his ministers, under

pretense of promoting his kingdom, have kindled the flames of persecution, and have used cruel revilings, and anathemas or curses, and excommunications, and racks, and prisons, and inquisitions, and all the bloody instruments of destruction, in the name of our compassionate Saviour, to harrass his subjects.

*Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum ?  
Tantævis animis cælestibus iræ ?*

Could the peaceful religion of Jesus inspire men with so much cruelty? Or can heavenly minds breathe out such rage and resentment? No, my friends; Christians are commanded, by the oracles of God, to love one another, to do good to all men, and to have peace among themselves! We have all one Father, and belong all to the same family. We are all enlisted under the same banner; have all the same dangers and the same enemies. We all depend on the same assistances; are all embarked in the same cause; are all travelling to the same country, and all expect a share in the same inheritance, with the saints in light. And, for these reasons, unanimity, peace, love and friendship are our duty. And to fall out by the way, or to bite and devour one another, is indecent and unbecoming. It is to enlist under the banner of the grand destroyer and enemy of mankind. It is to weaken, or to root out of our souls, that charity and good-will that are so essential to the Christian temper.

As I am, on this occasion, called by Providence, in a critical conjuncture, to recommend PEACE and UNITY to a number of Christian ministers and people, I pray that the good Spirit of God may breathe on us, and inspire us with dispositions to peace and love, with the spirit of a sound mind. He can smooth and soften the rigid temper, and open a heaven in our hearts.

I hope and persuade myself, my fathers and brethren, that you are all as much engaged in heart and affection as I can be, to pay the utmost deference to every command of Christ and his apostles, and as much determined to promote peace, harmony and union, in all the churches, to the utmost of your influence. Our Lord "walks among his candlesticks; holds his ministers as stars in his right hand;" and where two or three of his servants are met together, in his name, he is present with them. His piercing eye sees through every disguise, and it is our honor and our interest to be approved and finally rewarded by him.



Under such apprehensions of his presence, I will believe, that as we are all devoted to his service, so every one will wish me success, while I endeavor to heal breaches, and to promote peace: therefore I will speak with freedom, and expect a patient and candid hearing, in a cause which it is so much every one's honor and duty to promote; and, for this reason, I must recommend to your serious consideration the address of Paul in his bonds to the church of Ephesus, which I have read to you already, as the subject of my following discourse.

In these words, this church is warmly pressed, in general, to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called;" or, as it is expressed, Phil. ii, 20, "to walk as becomes the gospel of Christ;" that is, through the grace of God, to endeavor to know and to do their duty. To walk worthy of our vocation, is to live as becomes the children of God, and followers of Jesus Christ. It is to walk according to the precepts and commands of the gospel. It is to walk answerable to the aids and assistances afforded us by the Holy Spirit; answerable to the dignity and obligations of the Christian name, and answerable to the high and glorious expectations of every sincere Christian in a future state of honor and happiness.

In the second verse, our apostle, in a more particular manner, recommends peace, unity and concord, therein intimating that to walk worthy of their vocation is to walk in love, and to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, which is the grand and important point I have in view on this occasion. And that I may speak with the greater clearness, I propose, God assisting, to observe the following method:

I. I shall consider and explain the duty which is here commanded, viz., to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

II. I shall briefly consider the state of the church militant, whose imperfect condition renders it impossible to obey this command without charity and mutual forbearance.

III. I shall offer to your serious consideration what the apostle recommends as the best expedient to promote and preserve peace among Christians, viz., lowliness and meekness, long suffering and forbearance in love.

IV. I shall lay before you his arguments to enforce the discharge of this duty. And, lastly, I shall make some remarks by way of application.

1. I am to consider and explain the duty enjoined in the text. Christians are not only commanded, "if it be possible,

as much as lieth in them, to live peaceably with all men, and to give no offense to Jew or Gentile;" but they are obliged, in a more peculiar manner, as members of Christ's visible church, to cultivate peace and harmony among themselves. Our Lord expressly commands us to have peace with one another; and St. Paul exhorts us to "follow after the things that make for peace, and things wherewith we may edify one another;" for God is the author, not of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints. In the text we are to "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." We are commanded by the same authority, "to be at peace among ourselves." And again, "be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

Will we, then, call Christ our Lord and Master, and refuse obedience to these plain precepts? The apostle James tells us, "where envying and strife is, there is every evil work." And the apostle Paul makes strifes and divisions the fruits of a carnal, and not of a Christian, temper: "Whereas there is among you envy, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal?" He that has most charity, and is most condescending, (where condescension is necessary) has most of the gospel spirit, and is most acceptable to him who has said, "Blessed are the peace makers for they shall be called the children of God."

2. Peace and unity are necessary in all states and governments. Nothing could resist the Roman power, till, crumbled into parties and torn by factions, they fell by their own arms. And the discords of Athens destroyed that seat of liberty, learning and politeness. On the other hand, small states have flourished and grown powerful by peace and concord. Of this, Sparta is a memorable instance. Nor is this duty, so frequently recommended to the church of Christ, impossible or impracticable in itself. It has been, and is daily practiced in many political, as well as religious societies, greatly for their temporal good and emolument. And will not the subjects of the Prince of Peace, from the nobler motives of the gospel, as cordially unite to love one another, and promote the kingdom of Jesus, as the subjects of any earthly potentates, to promote their worldly concerns? Nay, there is an union and concord among the rulers of the kingdom of darkness. Satan's kingdom is not divided against itself, else it could not stand! and is that impracticable by the saints of God and the followers of Jesus Christ, that is daily practiced by wicked men and fallen angels? For shame! that we are

so far outdone in those very points wherein we are commanded to excel.

3. But though we are called as Christians to peace and union, it is not to unite to destroy the civil or religious rights of mankind; nor to promote parties, nor the peculiar shibboleths of any of the contending denominations of Christians, which are often the lesser matters of religion, and without any foundation on the holy Scriptures. No; we are to unite to promote the honor of God; the good of mankind, and the pure and holy religion of our Lord and Master. For this reason all Christians should join to maintain what they judge to be the great truths of the gospel. "We are to hold fast the form of sound words in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus." We are to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. Now, though the churches have not agreed in fixing every fundamental truth, or article of faith, yet all the churches agree that some truths and articles are fundamental. Undoubtedly, then, to preserve and propagate these, must be one great design of Christian union. Hence that eminent saying of one of the fathers: "We must maintain union in essentials, forbearance in lesser matters, and charity in all things." We must also unite to promote external purity and holiness of life, for, without this, "no man shall see the Lord." 'Tis necessary to the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of mankind. We are to have "no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," but must rather reprove them. We should remember that "Christ came to seek and to save lost sinners, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan to serve the living God;" and as his disciples and soldiers, we should all unite under him as our head, to promote the same cause. And though we are not, nor can not be, agreed about all the modes of promoting these great ends, and perhaps never will, in this imperfect state, yet we must consider, that while we have all one aim, or while we rather promote than oppose this grand design, we are to treat one another as friends, though we are not agreed in all things. For those are for us who are not against us, as Christ said of those that cast out devils in his name, though they followed him not.

4. In promoting and preserving peace and unity among Christians, we are carefully to follow the commands and example of Christ and his apostles; and not the expedients of our own devising. We must not expect that all our Chris-

tian brethren can attain to equal degrees of knowledge, or purity, much less must we set up ourselves for the standard. There was much difference in sentiment in the Jewish church, concerning the great command of the law, the traditions of the elders, and concerning the Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom; yet our Lord kept communion with them, and tried to reclaim them. Nay, he bore patiently with the ignorance and mistakes of his own disciples. In the days of the apostles, what different sentiments prevailed in the Christian churches about circumcision, the law of Moses, the difference of meats, and many other Jewish ceremonies? Thousands of Jews that were converted, as James said, were zealous of the law of Moses, while the Gentile converts made a stand for Christian liberty. Yet so far is the apostle Paul from allowing the churches of Christ to divide for this diversity of opinion, that he earnestly presses them to charity and mutual forbearance in these things. Hereby he informs us, that though church members be under many mistakes, yet they may be honest men, and sincere Christians, who serve God acceptably, and are approved by him.

If we would maintain peace and harmony in the house of Christ, such are to be received, but not to doubtful disputations. And such a forbearance in lesser matters is necessary, since a perfect agreement in all things (as shall be shown under the next head) is impossible in the church militant. And, for this reason, acts of uniformity in religion are of no use, but to fetter the conscience, and to harrass Christ's subjects. In short, to maintain union, we must take heed to our own spirits; must be prudent and patient; must bear with many things that we do not perfectly approve of in our neighbors; and must pray for the spirit of God, "whose fruits are love and peace, to work in us to will and to do according to his good pleasure." And

II. This brings me to the second head, which was to consider the temper, character and circumstances of those persons who compose the visible church of Christ, which will greatly help us to understand the nature of the peace and union here required; and lead us to the most efficacious means to procure and preserve it.

1. In this body, all men have not equal gifts by nature, nor equal opportunities of improving their natural gifts and abilities. There will be some in all ages, and in every church, of more extensive knowledge, "scribes instructed into the kingdom of heaven," who can bring out of their treasures

things new and old: "Apollos mighty in the Scripture." These are stars of the first magnitude, and the eyes of Christ's body, the church, provided their gifts be duly qualified with meekness, humility and condescension, to their weaker though useful brethren. The eye has need of the hand and the foot, for they are the useful and active members of the same body. Now, such men, even though saints, have no small trial to bear with the weakness, narrowness and ignorance of some of their fellow-Christians; who are pleased with their own measure of light and knowledge; are ready to make them the standard of all others; and are apt to condemn and revile all that see things in a light different from themselves. Thousands of zealous Christians were ready to deliver Paul to the secular power, for differing from them about the law of Moses. On the other hand, a mixture of pride, and a self-satisfaction from superior knowledge, are apt to swell men with conceit, and to prompt them to despise and set at nought their weaker brethren. For, as the apostle tells us, "knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." We should remember, that no ten men are agreed in all points; and that where they are agreed, they generally differ in their ways of explaining and defending them. Christ, we are told, has given different gifts to the members and ministers of his church, for their mutual edification and advantage. And men of the most extensive knowledge have not always been more useful than men of smaller attainments, accompanied with zeal and industry. For this reason, then, both should love, and neither should despise, nor set at nought his brother, nor refuse his assistance.

2. Men's natural tempers require great patience and forbearance. Some are naturally proud and imperious; and, in all things like Diotrephes, they love to have the preëminence. Such should learn to abate of their demands, and should know that others in Christ's house have the same rights with themselves. Some view only one side of a question, and draw hasty conclusions, without sufficiently examining the premises. And hence they are impatient of contradiction, tenacious of their mistakes, and have a sovereign contempt for all that differ from them. Some are dull and slow, and require time to consider and examine; and these we are apt to condemn as obstinate bigots, or stupid fools. Some are extremely selfish, and fond of what they call their own, and confine righteousness, and all that is excellent, within the little circle of a particular party. They entertain an overweaning notion of their own tenets, modes of worship, and distinguishing shibboleths;

and consequently are censorious, and uncharitable to all others. Thus the Jews derided the Christians, and the judaizing Christians the Gentile converts ; and the church of Rome confines salvation to her own votaries. The general fault of all is, that they are too much wrapt up in self-attachments, and have narrow and illiberal notions of God and the kingdom of his Son, Jesus Christ, and a strong inclination to promote and aggrandize themselves. Obstinacy is natural to some, while others are easily imposed on and deceived, and tossed to and fro "with every wind of doctrine;" and some so much regard imaginary points of honor, that they will rather persist in the wrong, than give up an opinion they have once espoused, lest they should have the imaginary disgrace of submitting, or of being vanquished. These are all bad distempers, both in sinners and saints, but will prevail while we are in this imperfect state.

Now all these, and many other such flaws in men's tempers, are to be dealt with softly and gently ; and in a way that contributes most to the glory of God, and the maintenance of peace and virtue among men. The most friendly methods of address must be studied ; what is good in them must be esteemed and commended, and the stronger must bear the infirmities of the weaker. We are called by Christ to exercise much long-suffering and forbearance toward all such persons, provided that Christian liberty can be preserved, and that such weak, or narrow, or proud, or selfish persons impose not their opinions on their brethren.

3. Men's different attainments in grace and holiness, make much patience and forbearance necessary. Men of superior holiness and piety must be grieved at many things, even in good, but weak men, as well as in the ignorant and unconverted. Such are sometimes to be instructed and admonished ; sometimes to be reproved tenderly, and in private ; and sometimes to be openly rebuked, and yet are by no means to be cast out of the church. For the church is Christ's school, to convert and reform sinners, and to build up his weak saints in holiness and purity.

Men of warmth and zeal can hardly bear with their fellow Christians of equal goodness, who are naturally more calm and moderate ; who are not so easily, nor so vehemently, moved against the errors and iniquities of the times, as they themselves are. They are apt to censure, or ready to break communion with them, as if they were either lukewarm and careless, or knaves at the bottom, and secret deceivers. And young



converts are not only ready to blame and condemn the ignorant, the profane, and the careless ; but even to censure men of superior attainments and experience, who enjoy the comforts of religion, without that emotion and transport which they felt at their first experience of the spiritual life. In all such cases nothing but charity and forbearance can maintain love and peace. The Scriptures rank Christians into three classes, viz., children, young men, and fathers. Some in Christ's visible church are little children, dear to God, and members of his family, yet are children in knowledge; noisy, peevish, and troublesome, and have every other bad quality of children. Nevertheless, as they are his children, they are to be treated with tenderness, and are entitled to the love, the care and affection of the young men and fathers ; that is, the stronger Christians, notwithstanding their failings and imperfections.

4. The nature of Gospel truths lays a deep foundation for great forbearance in the church of Christ. For though all truths are of singular advantage, yet they are not all of equal importance. The great things to be believed and practised are plain ; but some things are more dark and obscure, and depend on our knowledge of chronology or Jewish antiquities. Some things are hard to be understood, and have a reference to events yet wrapt up in the womb of futurity. Now, in all such cases, there is room, even for good men, to differ, and adhere to their particular notions and interpretations without any prejudice to our common salvation.

Are the doctrines about the degrees of affinity and consanguinity to be observed in marriage of equal importance with the belief of a God, and future state, and the method of salvation through a Redeemer? Is a point in chronology, or a difference in sentiment about Melchizedeck, of equal importance with the denying the doctrine of the new birth, the satisfaction of Christ, or the aid of the Spirit? Or may not men differ about the millenium, the return of the Jews to Judea at their conversion, and many other things, rather than in the necessity of a holy life? Time must remove some difficulties relating to Scripture prophecies, and the light of heaven, or the beatific vision, will possibly be the best comment to understand some other difficult texts. And how can men live together in peace without forbearance in such matters?

Some duties are strictly commanded in Scripture, and the ways and modes of performing those duties are, in a great measure, left to human direction, as is well observed in our

Confession of Faith.\* The public worship of God, and the administration of the sacraments, are never to be neglected ; but the time, place and modes that are most for edification, are not so precisely pointed out. In these things, and all of a like nature, where we have only general directions, there is great room for differing in judgment; and in such points the greatest and best men have differed, and will probably differ, till the church of God be translated from this state of ignorance and imperfection. Probably, then, in the meantime, there may be no better way of preserving peace and unity, than to leave every man, in all such points, to the persuasion of his own mind ; and to exercise charity, forbearance, and brotherly kindness, where the church believes the true design of the gospel is preserved, and its most essential duties faithfully performed. What the apostle determined concerning the observance of the new moons and Jewish feasts, is applicable in all such cases : "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be persuaded in his own mind."

5. This leads to another remark, which is, that men are more affected by what they see, than with what they hear. And all men, but more especially weak Christians, have a peculiar fondness for the ways to which they were early accustomed, and for the modes of religion that they have seen practised with solemnity and a certain awe of piety and devotion. 'Tis therefore but natural to them to pay a high regard to those ways and forms in which they have experienced much of the grace of God, and comforts of religion. This is, in a particular manner, applicable to the different modes of public worship, and of receiving the holy sacraments. Good men, who are for bringing all to their own measures, should remember that their fellow Christians have equal pleas for adhering to their own particular modes. They have experienced as much of the life and power and comforts of religion, in the way wherein they have been accustomed to attend on Christ in

---

\* Chap. I. sect. 6, Sub. Fin. "There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word which are always to be observed."

"All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned but the unlearned in a due use of the ordinary means may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them."

his ordinances, as those who are endeavoring to make them proselytes. And it is certain that God, who appointed these ordinances, has blessed them to his churches, though they have differed, and do differ, in the modes and ways of using them.

And, in a church like ours in America, collected from different churches of Christ in Europe, who have followed different modes and ways of obeying the "great and general command of the gospel," there is a peculiar call for charity and forbearance. And this becomes the more necessary, as the weaker or the more zealous Christians will be for imposing their favorite notions and practices, as what are alone authorized by the gospel. Now, in such circumstances, the stronger of Christ's servants must exert themselves, to maintain to all their Christian liberty, to prevent impositions and uncharitableness among Christians who differ in lesser matters; and should be contented to show their own sentiments in all such matters, by peacefully using that way, or mode, which they judge most agreeable to the word of God, and most for edification in these particular circumstances.

III. From this view of Christ's visible church, I am led to consider, what Christians are obliged to do to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, which was the third thing proposed.

1. And here we must observe, that there is no living infallible judge appointed by Christ to determine all controversies in his church, and so to maintain peace and unity. Synods and councils, and popes and fathers, have erred, and are liable to mistakes; for, as the apostle informs us, we all "know but in part." And this failure in knowledge is no less the lot of the Roman pontiff than of other men. The proud, assuming church of Rome is as much divided in sentiments and affection as any other church, notwithstanding all her vain pretenses. Every man must search the Scriptures, with the Berians, as far as he is capable; must believe for himself, and call no man on earth his master. The great doctrines of Christianity are plain, and God will guide the meek and lowly in the way that they should go. Though it is vain to pretend to be free from mistakes, yet may we safely depend on the Spirit of God to preserve us from damnable errors; for as many as are the children of God are led by his spirit. We are not to expect to be saved by the infallibility of our opinions, more than by the unsinning obedience of our practice. Both are equally

impossible, and a dependence on either for salvation, is equally to be rejected.

2. Nor is church unity to be maintained by inquisitions, or acts for uniformity in religion. These secular engines of men's contrivance may distress tender consciences, and make hypocrites, but can not enlighten the understanding. Every man must believe according to evidence; and all men are not capable of the same proofs, nor of seeing things in the same point of view. And is there no tenderness for such? Suppose any church, or secular power, or both in conjunction, are under mistakes. Will they impose them on men who can see, or are even persuaded that they see, these mistakes? How will the imposers vindicate their conduct to Christ? Or who gave them such authority over his servants? Christ's kingdom is not of this world; nor is it, like the kingdoms of this world, to be supported by force and arms. The secular powers are to take care that their subjects be good members of civil society; and they are to be a terror to evil-doers; but they are no ministers of Christ's kingdom, nor does he require the aids of their power to maintain peace and unity in his churches.

3. But to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, we should study to be well acquainted with the great truths of the gospel, that are plain and easy; and in which the churches of Christ are generally agreed. We should determine, and resolve to promote holiness and purity, peace and brotherly love. We should pity the weakness and imperfections of our brethren. We should imitate the tenderness and forbearance of Christ and his apostles, and always remember our own infirmities, and liableness to mistakes. And, actuated by a sense of these things, we should sincerely love all that profess to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and treat them as brethren, if, in any tolerable degree, they maintain his truths and obey his gospel. If we desire or expect peace in the church, we must in a particular manner take care to cultivate the seeds of it in our own tempers. But this brings me to enforce the directions in the text, as the most effectual expedients to allay our animosities, and promote peace and unity among Christians; and these are lowliness of mind, meekness, long suffering and forbearing one another in love.

Lowliness of mind, or humility, stands first, and is a grace of great importance to promote and maintain peace and unity among mankind, because from pride comes contention; whereas the humble man has no overweening conceit of himself, which might prompt him to despise, or set at nought, his

brother. Pride is vain, fond of power, haughty, assuming and intolerable. But humility gives us juster and more becoming sentiments of ourselves and our attainments. It levels the pride of the wise, and of the disputers of this world; teaches them that their understandings are narrow and limited; that there are many things beyond their confined grasp, and too high for them to understand. It commands us to give credit to God's testimony in matters of revelation; not to be wise above what is written; and, above all, not to be positive or dogmatical. It will keep us mindful that we have been sometimes mistaken, where we were very sanguine and certain that we were right, and will ever bring us to look to God for light and direction. It will keep us open to conviction, willing to learn, and ready to review our sentiments. In short, it will make us tender of our censures, and charitable to others from a sense of human weakness, even where we judge them mistaken, as long as they give evidences that they are sincere and conscientious.

Humility will give us a moderate opinion of our knowledge and attainments, compared with those of other men. If we know more than some of our brethren in some particulars, do they not exceed us in other parts of useful knowledge? Do not many know more than we do? Or, suppose our knowledge ever so extensive, what have we that we did not first receive? Does not the grace of God make one man differ from another in attainments, as one star from another in glory? Why then should any man despise his brother, because God has not thought fit to distinguish him so eminently for wisdom and knowledge. 'Tis certain, that this great and honorable gift is no easy trust, if we endeavor to improve it aright. Knowledge with humility is amiable and useful; but knowledge with pride is the source of contentions, the bane of the church, and the destruction of mankind. Humility will also cure that pride and censoriousness that arises from an opinion of superior holiness and purity. The proud Pharisees trusted that they were righteous, and despised others. Humility in the mouth of the best men, will speak the language of holy Job, "Lord, I am vile, what shall I answer?" Or will say with the Psalmist, "If thou, Lord, should mark iniquities, O Lord, who should stand?" How far do we all come short of what the law of God requires, and of what we pray and resolve to be? Who would maintain a tolerable character in the world, if all the workings of his soul, if all his vain and sinful thoughts were open to our view? "Who can understand his errors?"

And what need has every one to pray that God would cleanse him from secret faults. A lowly sense of our own need of pardon and of Christ's imputed righteousness' will keep us from the pharisaical arrogance of thanking God that we are "not as other men;" and much more will it prevent our casting out our weaker brethren, or rending and dividing the churches, under pretenses that they come not up in all things to our attainments in purity and holiness. It will make us charitable to others where there is the appearance of grace and a holy life; merciful and pitiful to human failures and miscarriages, knowing that we are in the flesh, and liable to temptations. It will excite compassion toward those that are ignorant, and out of the way; and will make us ready to restore such as have fallen, "in the spirit of meekness."

In short, humility will teach us our wants and dependence on one another; will make men of high rank condescend to those who are their inferiors; and will promote a general desire among all men to oblige one another; for "the eye can not say to the hand or the foot, I have no need of thee." Where there are real excellencies, it will engage us to observe and esteem them, and in lowliness of mind to think others better than ourselves. How does it win the hearts of mankind, to see men of superior stations, of superior knowledge, or superior holiness, humble and obliging? How justly then is this grace recommended in the text, as a powerful means to preserve peace and unity.

Meekness is next recommended, as necessary for the same purpose. Christ has pronounced the meek blessed. We are commanded "to receive with meekness the ingrafted word;" and our Lord bids us, "learn of him, to be meek and lowly in spirit." How useful is this heavenly temper to maintain peace? It is not easily provoked, but slow to wrath. It prevents resentments to exceed the demerit of the offense; will not speak unadvisedly to widen breaches, by ill-natured and irritating reproaches; but rather inclines to give "a soft answer," that "turneth away wrath." The meek soul takes no advantage of his neighbor's temper; is ready to be reconciled after a breach, knowing that "anger resteth in the bosom of fools," and is unwilling to take hasty or severe methods of redress, when a redress becomes necessary. As meekness is not ready to take, so it is cautious of giving any man offense: it considers men's humors, and is careful not to fret or provoke them; renders to all men their dues; is conscientious in the discharge of relative duties; and studies by word or deed to



give no just ground of offense. "Put them in mind," says the apostle, "to speak evil of no man," to be no brawlers, but gently showing all meekness unto all men. But, above all, this grace will suppress our anger and passion in matters of religion; will oblige us to make allowances for smaller differences; will manage debates, where debates are necessary, with coolness and candor, moderation and a just regard to reason and argument. The apostle James gives this as the character of a wise man, who is endowed with knowledge, that he shows, out of a good conversation, his works with "meekness of wisdom;" and Paul says, "the servant of the Lord must be gentle unto all men, patient in meekness, instructing those that oppose themselves; if, peradventure, God will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth."

Long-suffering is next recommended. God bears long with us, and he commands us to bear with one another. Without this, there can be no peace maintained in private families, in civil societies, or in the churches of Christ. When the apostle recommends peace and unity to the church at Rome, he uses these words, "now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded toward one another." Here two divine perfections are mentioned to promote unity and peace: The God of patience, because he patiently bears with sinners, and teaches and enables them to bear with one another; and unless we do so, we are not his children, nor can we have peace among ourselves. To this is annexed the God of consolation, because peace in the churches of Christ is one main-spring of comfort and edification.

We can not live in Christ's visible church, where there is so much weakness and imperfection, without bearing with many things which we can not entirely approve. When we consider how easily all men are betrayed, through infirmity, passion or surprise, to things that lessen their own honor, and hurt their neighbors; when we consider their different attainments in knowledge and grace; their different tempers, education and views, we must either suffer wrongs, bear injuries and provocations, and make allowances for inadvertencies, indiscretions and mistakes, else we can not live as Christians; but he that suffers long and learns to bear with these evils, lives superior to the lesser storms of life, and in patience possesses his soul; while the jealous and captious, the peevish and hasty, live in continual vexation, and disturb their own peace and the peace of their neighbors.

4. We are commanded to forbear one another in love. In

order to peace, we are not only to bear, but to forbear. No virtue is more necessary to men, in all stations and relations of life, than forbearance. We can never set all men right. We need great allowance and forbearance ourselves, and should give the same to others. Epictetus said many fine things as a philosopher, and yet they may be all comprehended in bearing and forbearing. But this is a duty not only recommended by reason, but also by revelation. The inspired apostle commands us, "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another; if any man have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you, so do ye also." Christ commands us to forgive an offending brother as oft as seventy times seven. 'Tis the character of charity, "that it beareth all things;" and, in the epistle to the Galatians, Christians are commanded to "bear one another's burdens, and so to fulfil the law."

'Tis impossible for persons so different in their tempers, knowledge and grace, to live as the members of the same body, without long-suffering and forbearance, nothing being more impracticable than to bring all men in all things to a uniformity in sentiments. And nothing has so much divided and torn in pieces the churches of Christ, as an imposing, intolerant spirit. Many things will ever demand compassion and forbearance and love; and they can only by such gentle methods be removed, or healed, or prevented from hurting the church of Christ. What furious debates prevailed in the churches about the time of keeping of Easter; about the descent into hell; about the habits of clergymen and the like; yet now-a-days no church is much concerned about these things; they are neither considered nor respected as the essentials, or great matters of religion. It seems, at length, as agreed among Christians of good sense, and a charitable turn of mind in all churches, that these, and many such things, demand Christian forbearance. In short, no church will ever subsist long on a firm foundation, without a tolerating and forbearing spirit in the lesser matters, unity in the great matters of faith and patience, and cordial charity in all things.

And this brings me to another remark, founded on the text, viz.: That our forbearance must not proceed from pride, haughtiness, peevishness or disregard, as if our brethren were unworthy our notice. This will neither mend, nor unite them to us. Our forbearance must be in love. This is Christ's new commandment, and the grand cement of the church. 'Tis

a sovereign remedy for our censures and jealousies. It will excite us to abate and yield as much as we can for peace, and to desire an entire union even where we differ. When Christians do not love one another, they magnify differences, find pretences to divide; and wish and seek and rejoice in one another's ruin! But to engage us to forbear, and to love one another, let us always remember what the apostle John says, "he that loves not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

IV. To enforce this great and necessary duty of peace and unity, the apostle uses a variety of the most powerful arguments, that I am now, in the fourth place, briefly to open up, and offer to your serious consideration. "There is one body and one spirit," etc.

[*There is one body.*] Here, and in many other places of the Holy Scriptures, Christians are represented as one august body, whereof Christ is the head. And this consideration must be a powerful motive to union, love and concord. For nothing is more unnatural than for members of the same body to destroy one another. They are all appointed for mutual service, and "the eye can not say to the hand or the foot, I have no need of you." Fools and madmen tear their own flesh, and mangle their own limbs. Can we, then, be so mad, or so cruel to fellow-members of that Christian body to which we belong, of that body of which Christ is the head, as to cut them off as useless, or to treat them as if we had no connexion with them? Do we believe that our Lord will not plead their cause? Or is it decent, safe or honorable, to render any person useless or contemptible, whom he vouchsafes to approve.

Menenius Agrippa, a nobleman of great wisdom, reduced the discontented Romans, and brought them to their temper and duty, by showing how inconsistent it would be with the welfare of the body, for the members and the belly to quarrel. This so touched these discontented heathens, that they readily came to terms of peace and reconciliation with the senate. And shall the members of Christ's body have less regard to their common safety and welfare? Do not our divisions as much expose and weaken us, as the divisions in that empire did the Romans? Or shall it be said, that all other united bodies are more affectionate, and more ready to help and befriend one another, than Christians? Or shall we, of all denominations of Christians, be thought the worst and most unfriendly? Sure, this is indecent and greatly out of character! The heathen admired how the primitive Christians loved one

another. Will Christ our head, will the good angels, or will sober good men, approve our contentions and divisions? And if such a conduct be scandalous and unsafe, no church has a louder call for reformation than ours at this very time.

[*There is one Spirit.*] There is one spirit that inspires, strengthens and guides all the children of God, though his graces be given in various degrees. "As many as are the children of God, are led by the Spirit of God, and if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," his fruits are love, joy and peace. And can men who are habitually unkind and uncharitable say they are led or guided by this blessed agent? Can such as will not listen to terms of love and friendship with their fellow-Christians, pretend to his guidance, or are they in any tolerable degree fitted to live in the kingdom of heaven, where perfect love and friendship reign? 'Tis the great work of the Spirit, in the economy of redemption, to unite all believers to Christ as their head, and to unite them in peace and love among themselves. Sure, then, nothing can be more unchristian, or more contrary to his design, than envy, strife and contention. Can he inspire hatred or uncharitableness? or be the author of schisms or divisions? No, these things are the deeds of the flesh, and the works of the kingdom of darkness which he came to destroy. And must it not grieve him to see this grand design disappointed? Sure we can not imagine that all Christians act and believe as inspired with one spirit, while they are divided and torn into parties, and while they promote the kingdom of the devil, by their malice, rage and uncharitableness. Shall infernal spirits more faithfully unite under their hellish leader, than professed Christians under the leading and conduct of the Spirit of God? Or will the peace of God rest on those who neither love nor seek peace with one another? A *divided church* is a house divided against itself, and he that foment or encourages, or secretly wishes for the continuance of such a state, is destroying the church of Christ. He may provoke the Holy Spirit to withdraw his comfortable and healing influences, and leave him to follow the devices of his own blinded understanding.

[*One hope of your calling.*] Another argument he uses is, that we are all called in one hope of our calling. As lost sinners we have all the same hopes of pardon, and the favor of God in this world, and of eternal life in the next. And should not those hopes humble our pride, inspire us with love, and unite us in peace and friendship? We have all offended God,

and continue daily to offend him, and will we forgive nothing, who must be ruined forever, unless he forgive us so much? Our compassionate Redeemer strongly assures us, that "unless we from our hearts forgive every man his brother their trespasses, neither will God forgive us." Let all that grumble, and are sour, and uncharitable, and unwilling to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, consider that these are the words of Christ, and that heaven and earth shall sooner pass away, than any of his words shall fall to the ground. If we, then, have all one hope to be pardoned and forgiven, why will we not all as cordially receive Christ's declarations and comply with the gospel terms, on which these hopes are founded?

We all hope for the same inheritance and are travelling to Immanuel's land, and is it not hard that brethren can not travel together in peace, but will fall out by the way? Shall we refuse to live together in unity on earth, who soon hope to be fellow-members of the glorious general assembly and church of the first-born? Sure none of us hate any of our brethren to that degree, that we wish never to see them in the kingdom of glory. And shall we who hope soon to unite in singing the song of Moses and the Lamb in heaven, refuse to unite together at the command of our Redeemer, to promote his kingdom and interest upon earth?

[*One Lord.*] Another argument to engage us to peace and unity is, that we have all one Lord; Christ is not divided. He has but one interest, and in this all his followers ought to be united. But can his kingdom be so well promoted, while his subjects are divided? Or, if we all faithfully serve the same master, how can we be at variance? Shall we, then, who are all enlisted under his banner, all united against one common enemy, all called by his name, and all protected and provided for by his power and grace; shall we who are all as living stones built on the same foundation, or as living members deriving vital influence from the same head; shall we, I say, notwithstanding all these endearing ties, worry, and calumniate, and hate, and despise one another? Christ commands us to be at peace among ourselves. He searches our hearts, and knows our most secret inclinations, and it is vain to call him our Lord, unless the powers of our souls are subject to his influence, and unless we yield an unreserved obedience to whatsoever he commands us. Would our Lord preside in our assembly as he did among his disciples, or would he condescend to appear in clouded majesty, as he will appear to judge the

world, and would he command us to be at peace among ourselves, would we not lay aside our grudges, would not all our cavils and difficulties vanish? And would we not cast ourselves down at his feet, and with tears of joy obey him? The case is now the same, we know that he is really, though not visibly, present with us. We know as well that he has commanded this duty, as if we heard his living voice. We know that he sees through all our pretenses and excuses, and knows "all the divisions of Reuben," that occasion the thoughts of the heart. Can any argument then be stronger, or can anything more powerfully excite us to this duty, than that we are all united to Christ as our common Lord, and should be united to one another.

[*One Faith.*] There is but one faith. That faith which was once delivered to the saints, the doctrines of salvation by a crucified Saviour, which we have all believed, and all embraced. And there is but one grace by faith, by which we are all united to Jesus Christ. And since we are so closely united in the same faith, and in the same designs, under the same Lord and Master, how can we be divided as enemies, or hate one another?

[*One Baptism.*] There is but one baptism, by which we were all admitted as members of the same visible church, enlisted as good soldiers under Christ's banner, and devoted to the service of the living God. By our baptism we are obliged to resist the world, the flesh and the devil; to keep the commandments of God, and to promote his honor, and the salvation of lost sinners. And can these things be as effectually promoted, while we despise and revile, as if we aided and assisted one another? If we were enlisted under different leaders, we might be tempted to divide to promote their different interests; and, therefore, to cure the Corinthian divisions, Paul uses this very same argument, drawn from our baptism: Is "Christ divided," says the apostle; "was Paul crucified or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?"

[*One God and Father of all.*] Lastly: To excite us to live as one united body, he puts us in mind that we have all but one Father. God honors us with the endearing name of his children. But can we say we are like him who is love, and dwells in love, if we are filled with hatred and ill-nature? Does it become rebels, who are exalted to such privileges and expectations? Does it become the poor apostate children of Adam, who are taken into his family through grace and favor, to dishonor him and themselves by quarrels and contentions?



Or will the children of so benevolent a parent bite and devour one another? O, my brethren, let us remember this endearing name, and live in peace, that the God of peace may be with us!

As these arguments have been urged by an inspired apostle, for the very same ends for which I have used them, they must have the same force to us as to the church of Ephesus, for we see that we all claim the same glorious privileges that belonged to that church; we all belong to the same Lord, have all one faith and one hope; are all admitted by baptism as members of the same church, are all led by the same Spirit, and all count it our honor, and our happiness, to have God for our Father; and for these reasons, are indispensably obliged, unless we would forfeit these privileges, to live in peace; to love one another as brethren, and to observe this apostolic command, which is to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

#### APPLICATION.

1. From this view we have taken, of the members of Christ's visible church, who are so unlike one another in knowledge, in temper, in education, and in the attainments of holiness, we may be convinced, though peace and unity be a great and an indispensable duty, and of the highest importance to the churches of Christ, yet it is not to be procured, nor preserved, without patience, forbearance, and self-denial. Our own good tempers are the great obstacles; and these we must first deal with. How unreasonable is it for any man to expect that his neighbor shall do all, and he himself do nothing! How arrogant to pretend to dictate the terms of peace to others, without setting the example by gentleness, and a Christian compliance with all their reasonable demands! Has any man a right to think that all the world shall bend to his notions, and yield him uncontested obedience? Let us suppose ourselves infallibly right; so was our Lord Jesus, yet he bore with many lesser faults and infirmities in his disciples, thereby setting us an example that we should follow his steps.\* Did the old Romans count it their honor to forgive every personal injury that came in competition with the good of their commonwealth, and shall the redeemed of the Lord, under the light of the gospel, do less for the glory of Zion and the good of the Christian world? It would cer-

\* Hence that honorable expression among them: "Condonare inimicitias respublicæ."

tainly give us joy to see breaches healed, and peace restored, in any branch of Christ's church, and have we not the grace and resolution to practise that, in our own case, which we so much love and applaud in others?

In a word, my fathers and brethren, besides all the arguments I have already mentioned, give me leave to add, that such is the situation of affairs, both temporal and spiritual, that we must determine to lay aside our fruitless animosities, or behold our religion destroyed and our names become a reproach among good men. The sole question now is, whether we can forbear and forgive one another; or whether we are determined to sacrifice character, duty, and happiness to pride, obstinacy, love of superiority or false honor? What a shame it is to see men who can follow peace, when it is for their temporal advantage, neglect and refuse it in the important affairs of their eternal salvation! What name does such a conduct deserve? It is flagrant rebellion against the Almighty God, open despite to that great and new commandment, which he has made the test of our Christianity, and the first proof of our allegiance to the kingdom of his Son Jesus.

2. From what has been said, 'tis evident that Christians can only be agreed in the great matters of faith and practice; and must exercise charity in many things where they can not agree. Hence, allow me to remark, my fathers and brethren, that we must either disobey God, and proclaim to the world that we are among the very worst of men, or we must unite in peace and friendship. For no Protestant church, no denomination of Christians, are more unanimously agreed in the essentials of religion, than we are. Our synods have no disputes concerning their general plan of doctrine, worship, discipline and church government. And the greatest part of our ministers on both sides, never gave one another the least offense. Few of those who heretofore differed are now alive; and those who are alive have long ago professed and exercised friendship to one another. Let me, then, conjure and beseech you, in the name of Christ, to examine your conduct. What is the bane of our church? What can tempt us to live as if we had no connection with one another? Or what root of bitterness destroys our mutual harmony? Look on the divided state of our flocks! See the limbs of the same body torn asunder! and many of them by our unhappy divisions like to be forever deprived of gospel ordinances! Is this a state favorable to the religion of one common master or advantageous to ourselves? How contemptible a body does it

render us ? How easy a prey to our foes, if any think fit to deceive or mislead us ? And how great a reproach to our friends ? Are we not ripening for a stroke from our anti-Christian enemy, and ill prepared for such a day of trouble and rebuke ? Would we willingly die in such a state of contention, and leave such a mischievous legacy to our children ? O, my fathers, brethren and friends, let us at last resolve to obey the gospel, live in peace, and the God of peace will be with us. And let us pray that the Spirit of grace would give a healing temper to all the divided churches of Christ.

Without such a life, what good can we look for here ? Or with what confidence can we call ourselves the ministers of the blessed Jesus ? Every one should rather consider his own mistakes, than be eagle-eyed to mark and expose his neighbor's. We must bear with our people, and one another. We must not be self-willed nor self-pleasers ; nor must we put the laboring oar into our neighbor's hand, and sit at our ease and command him. All the meekness and condescension which the apostle so warmly recommends is necessary ; and as well may we expect the cure without the means, as well may we expect a harvest without plowing and sowing, or a victory without toils and dangers and watchings, as peace without forgiveness, self-denial, and forbearance. And shall we decline any difficulties in obtaining that which so much belongs to our Christian profession ? Or shall we be discouraged through fear or the danger of disappointment ? Let us do our endeavors. Men's hearts are in God's hand. The duty is ours, and the blessing is his. No good man should be ever discouraged from his duty, through fear of opposition ;\* and why then should we look for better success or more ease in the world than the best of God's servants ? Or will we do nothing till there be no opposition in promoting the kingdom of Christ ? Or shall we live to see such happy days ? This time is rather to be wished for than expected in this state of suffering and of sin. But will we run no risks, " nor cast our nets again at the command of Christ, though we have hitherto toiled and taken nothing ?" Once more, I entreat you, my fathers and brethren, let us, when so loudly called upon, dare to do our duty, and leave the success in the hands of Almighty Wisdom.

Allow me to make one remark more, from what has been said, and I shall have done. The best men have, in every society, been the most charitable, peaceable, and condescending ;

\* While men are weak, or wicked, there will be opposition to every good undertaking.

the most open to conviction, and most ready to forgive injuries. They ever breathe the spirit of peace and good-will, and are remarkable for a growing conformity to the peaceful state of the blessed above. As for us, my brethren, the greatest and best men of our particular persuasion, who were heretofore unhappily concerned in our divisions, have, to my certain knowledge, most heartily lamented them, and used unwearied diligence for establishing peace, and longed to see it accomplished. The reverend, exemplary, and pious fathers of this church, Messrs. John Thompson, Jonathan Dickinson, Thomas Evans, Samuel Blair, Francis McHenry, and Aaron Burr, who, we have good reason to believe, are now in glory, pressed earnestly after it, sought for it, and labored to accomplish it, till they were called from their labors here to a better state. And of those who now survive, Mr. George Gillespie, that pious, zealous saint of God, has often endeavored it, and on this occasion has sent us (possibly) his last, most pressing and friendly direction. Here, too, I shall take the liberty to mention Mr. Gilbert Tennant, though present, who has written more, and suffered more for his writings, to promote peace and union, than any member of this divided church. None of all his useful writings do him more honor than his *Irenicum*, or "Peace of Jerusalem," which was treated with great indifference by one party, and with great contempt by the other. And both, instead of thanking the man that reached out a friendly hand to help us over our difficulties, were ready to worry and despise the peace-maker. And, in justice to all the other members of both synods, as far as I have the honor of their acquaintance, I must declare that they seem grieved for our divisions, and greatly concerned to restore peace; and 'tis well known, that some, in a particular manner, have esteemed it a matter of the greatest importance to the kingdom of Christ, and have exerted themselves with much candor and friendship, to the utmost of their power, to attain what we so much need and long for. O, that God would direct and prosper their endeavors, and crown them with the blessings of the peace-makers, who are called the *children of God*!

Upon the whole, then, with whom shall we consult on this interesting occasion? Or whose advice shall we follow? Should we have recourse to some of the weakest Christians, under their prejudices and mistakes; or should we give way to the pride and corruptions of our own hearts; or should we consult the worst of mankind; or obey the fallen angels; no doubt but they would all unite in sentiment, and cry out that it is base, or dishonorable, or inexpedient and dangerous,

to unite in the bonds of peace: at least they would insist on terms that were impossible and impracticable, abatements and stipulations, only to gratify pride and ill-nature. But were we to be advised by the best men that are now alive in all the churches of God; or by our holy departed friends that are now "the spirits of just men made perfect;" if we listen to the apostles and prophets of Jesus Christ; or were the angels of God, those ministers of peace, who rejoice in the conversion of sinners, to persuade and advise us; or would we call to mind and obey the great command of our wise and gracious Redeemer; or, in one word, were we determined to pay obedience to our Creator and Preserver, the God of peace and love and long-suffering, all, all, with one united voice, would advise and conjure us to put away anger, wrath and malice, and to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; which, that we may be all persuaded and enabled to do, may God grant for the sake of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

---

#### ART. IX.—RECENT GERMAN WORKS.

By C. A. BRIGGS, Berlin, Prussia.

1. *Christliche Dogmatik von Dr. Alois Biedermann*. The author, Prof. of Theology in Zurich, belongs to the Swiss Rationalistic school, whose principal organ is the *Zeitstimmen*. The work here presented to the public is a remarkable one, and well worthy the attention of theologians. He gives a very thorough statement of Dogmatics in its biblical and historical forms, but only to undermine and destroy it by his criticism, and substitute a few fragments in its place. It reminds one of Strauss' *Life of Jesus*, taking his earlier and later works together—indeed, the author candidly admits his obligations to the philosophy of Hegel and the criticism of Strauss. The views of the various church parties are so stated that they mutually contradict and destroy one another, so that the whole system is ready to fall at the first breath of criticism. Schenkel does not satisfy him; he makes too much of the ethical principle and the conscience, which can afford no proper foundation for theology; and he presents the historical Christ in too positive and definite form. Strauss suits our author much better. His scheme is thus:

Part I. The (fundamental) *Principle*. 1. The nature of Religion. 2. Religion and Science. 3. The (fundamental) Principle of Christian Dogmatics. The *real* principle is contained in the idea *Son of God*, which came into history as a new religious fact in the religious personality of Jesus. The history of Christian doctrine is the historical expression of this principle, immediately as the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, mediately of the other doctrines presupposed in, and consequent upon, this central doctrine.

The *formal* principle was expressed at the Reformation as the *sole authority*

of the word of God. The old Protestants identified the word of God with the Scriptures—the new Protestants distinguish between the word of God and the Scriptures. The inspiration and authority of the Scriptures have been pressed from point to point by sound criticism; from the *entire* contents of the Bible to its *religious* contents—from the *entire* Old and New Testament revelation to its *chief facts*—from thence to the person of Christ—thence to *his doctrine*—thence to the *religious* spirit of Christ—and finally to the universal religious and moral contents of the spirit of Christ. The old Protestants identified the word of God with its human testimonies—the new Protestants seal the word of God by a critical examination of the testimonies. The Scriptures are the *historical* source of the doctrine, but no portion of Scripture can be identified with the idea *word of God*. There is, then, no *absolute* contrast between Tradition and Scripture. Church tradition is the secondary source—both Scripture and church doctrine come under one head; afford the common historical material for a scientific statement of Dogmatics. Thus Dogmatics has its *formal* as well as its *material* principle in the *religious principle* that came into history in the religious personality of Jesus. It has to gain a knowledge of this principle by a scientific analysis of its contents, as unfolded in the history of church doctrine, and then develop this knowledge speculating into a system.

II. *Historical Part. A. Doctrine of the Scriptures.* (I.) The Biblical ideas presupposed in the gospel of Jesus. 1. Biblical Theology. 2. Biblical Anthropology. 3. The old Covenant in the light of the new. (II.) The gospel of Jesus, the Christ. 1. The Christology of the Synoptists. 2. Pauline Christology. 3. Christology of John. (III.) The Realization of Christian Redemption in Humanity. (1.) The Application of Redemption to man, Biblical Soteriology. 2. The completion of Redemption, Biblical Eschatology. B. *The Church Doctrine.* (I.) The Christology of the Church in its Historical form. 1. The Person of Christ. 2. The Work of Christ. (II.) The Doctrines presupposed in the Christology of the Church. 1. Theology. 2. Anthropology. 3. The divine Will in Redemption as related to Christ. Appendix, *Pneumatology* of the Church. (III.) The Doctrines consequent upon the Christology of the church. The realization in humanity of the redemption unfolded in Christ. 1. Soteriology. 2. Eschatology.

III. *Critical and Speculative Part.* (I.) Criticism of the church doctrine from the Christian principle and its postulates. 1. Christology. 2. Theology. 3. Anthropology. Appendix, *Pneumatology*. (2.) The Scientific conception of the Christian Principle, and what is presupposed therein. 1. Theology. 2. Anthropology. 3. Christology. (III.) The Christian life in Redemption. 1. The Eternal Ground of Redemption. 2. Its Temporal Accomplishment, Soteriology. 3. Its Eternal Destiny, *Eschatology*.

By a negative criticism of Christology, and the doctrines presupposed therein, the ground is cleared—prepared for a positive structure, built by a scientific development of the Christian principle. A criticism of the church doctrine of the person and work of Christ discloses them as incongruent—for every conception of the christological problem that *defines* the person of Christ, develops itself into contradictions. The fundamental fault in Christology is the *identification* of the *Christian principle* with the *person of Christ*. The Christian



principle alone is essential—it is the new religious life power that has entered into humanity; it is the *divine sonship of man*, first made known in the person and life of Jesus Christ, who had the full consciousness of his Sonship. The absolute religious self-consciousness in which the real *Divine Human* consists, realizes itself as pure spiritual life in the communion of man with God, as Fatherhood on the part of God and Sonship on the part of man. *This* is what the church doctrine has sought to determine, and has presented us in a *mythical* form a definition of the person of the God-man—namely, the relation between God and man, the absolute and finite spirit, the Christian principle of divine sonship which came into history in the religious personality of Jesus. In this *divine sonship* of man, the absolute religious self-consciousness, is to be found the working power of the Christian principle, which the church doctrine has presented in the doctrine of the *work* of the God-man. Now, Jesus' life was the first self-realization of that principle in a historic person, and hence his importance. As the historical revelation of the redemptive principle Jesus is the historical redeemer.

The work is an able and powerful one, and will, we fear, do much harm. The power of Rationalism seems to be concentrated in Switzerland. We fear that such men as Sweizer, Keim, and Biedermann, may have more influence upon our land than their Lutheran predecessors.

*Die Lehre von der Offenbarung. Ein Beitrag zum Phil. des Christenthum von LIC. ALFRED KRAUSS.* An able work from an evangelical standpoint, by a Swiss theologian, is well fitted to counteract the work of Biedermann. It is a worthy companion, if not supplanter, of Rothe *zur Dogmatik*. I. The Foundation for a Doctrine of Revelation is prepared by a Development of the idea of Religion. 1. General Relation between Religion and Revelation. 2. The Reality of Religion. 3. Explanation and Psychological derivation of Religion according to the latest writers. 4. The Psychological facts presupposed in Religion. 5. A Psychological Definition of Religion and *Revelation*.

II. The Witnesses for Revelation. 1. The Problem stated. 3. The Possibility of a Revelation. 3. Objections against special Revelations answered. 4. Natural Religion. 5. Sin.

III. The Contents of Revelation. 1. What is implied in the Need of a Revelation. 2. The Law. 3. The Gospel. 4. The Kingdom of God.

IV. The Forms of Revelation. 1. The Elements in General. 2. Miracles. 3. Christophanies. 4. The Bearers of Revelation, (a) the Mediator, (b) the Prophets, (c) the Apostles.

Religion is psychologically considered a *condition* in which *feeling* prevails; it is "*das Bestimmte des Ich durch Gott*." Revelation is, subjectively considered, all that influences man to religion; it is, "*das von Gott veranstaltete kundwerden Gottes als uns zur Religion nothigend*." The need of special revelation is grounded on the condition of sin. Revelation has its true witness and attestation in its adaptation to the needs of man—to destroy the power of sin and restore and perfect our original nature. Divine revelation testifies to itself, by appeasing our consciences, satisfying our souls, enlightening our reason, whereby our spiritual nature is fitted for true religion. Where these marks are—there man is in the sphere of special divine revelations.

A *miracle* is an event, which can not be explained out of the *immanent* effi-

cacy of finite cause, but must be carried back to the working of a supernatural cause, thereby compelling us to the recognition of God.

*Die Religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel* von D. B. VON HENEBERG, Prof. of Theology, Munich, 2nd grösstentheils umgearbeitete Auflage. A learned book by a Roman Catholic Prof., written in a liberal spirit, which a Protestant may read with profit. His scheme is:

I. The oldest forms of religion, Patriarchal worship. II. Heathenism among the neighboring people, especially the Canaanites and Mesopotamians. III. The fundamental principles of the Mosaic religion. IV. The Places of Worship. V. The Forms of Worship. VI. The Persons engaged in the Worship. VII. Sacred Times. The author shows an acquaintance with the literature, and uses freely the best Protestant authorities. His Romanism appears indirectly, but in no offensive form. He uses the Apocryphal books with respect, has a special veneration for the Vulgate, and the opinions of the Scholastics, and in his symbolism points to the institutions of Romanism as the realization of the Mosaic forms. The tabernacle and the temple have passed over into the Christian church. The *προναός*, with its baptismal basin, corresponds with the outer court with its altar of burnt-offering and its basins. The *ναός* answers to the Holy place with its lamp and table of shew-bread. The Presbyterium with the eucharistic altar answers to the Holiest of All and the mercy-seat. The blessings and curses of the Old Law find their parallel in the blessings of the priests and the *anathema maranatha* of the church. The Jewish vows and the Nazarite are realized in the Christian minch. In the *Eucharist* the solemn offering meal of the priest—which consisted in consecrated flesh and the mincha—are fulfilled. The former, because the flesh and blood of the most holy offering, are partaken—and the latter because the form under which this takes place is that of the *mincha* offering.

*Der Apostel Paulus Schreiben an die Galater. Ein Freiheitsbrief für die Christenheit ausgelegt* von Dr. F. BRANDES. A theological commentary, full of instructive matter, written in a full and brilliant style—an interesting exposition of the freedom of the gospel and Paul's position against the Judaizers. He asserts the full harmony of Gal. ii and Acts xv, and the essential agreement of the apostles Peter, Paul and James, notwithstanding individualities and differences.

*Die Weissagungen des Prophet Ezeckiel* von E. W. HENGSTENBERG. A practical commentary for preachers and the people. It is useful and suggestive, like all the author's works. He hopes the time will soon come when every pastor will daily read his chapter in the original of the Old Testament, as well as in the New.

*Hebraisches Taschen Wörterbuch* *ü* das A. T. von D. J. FÜRST. A handy pocket edition of his larger work. Fürst's books do not take in Germany. There seems to be a lack of scholarly, independent investigation in the man—a lack of critical taste and discernment. His books are not at all calculated to displace Gesenius. Robinson's Gesenius might be revised—but Fürst will not supply its place.

*Ewald. Die Propheten. III. Band.* In this volume the most of the peculiarities, in connection with prophetic literature, of Ewald appear. This new edition is entirely remodeled and the whole of Daniel given for the first time by him. This volume presents the latest Hebrew prophets. The earlier prophets attached their name to their writings, because they were publicly known as

prophets, and publicly declared their prophecies, before they were written; whereas, during the later period of the exile, the prophets were not free to speak, but could only write, and thus not appear before the public with their prophecies and attach their names to them.

This period is toward the end of the captivity. 1. The unknown author of Isaiah xxi, 1-10. The earliest of this group. 2. Unknown author of Isaiah xiii, 2; xiv, 23. Both of these written at Babylon before the conquest by Cyrus. 3. The *great unknown* Isaiah xl-lxvi. The author was a descendant of the Jews who went with Jeremiah to Egypt. Chap. lv, 19; lvii, 11 is taken from an older prophet; and lviii-lix, 20; and lxiii, 1-6, are taken from an earlier cotemporary; lxiii, 7-lxvi is a later addition by the same prophet to his original work. 4. The unknown Jeremiah iv, 41, descendant of the few Jews left in the Holy Land itself. Isaiah xxxiv-xxxv, 10, is by the same author. 5. The unknown Isaiah xxiv-xxvii in the time when Cambyses made his Egyptian expedition. 6. In the *New Jerusalem*, Haggai, Zachariah (except ix-xi; xiii, 7-9, which were written by a cotemporary of Isaiah, and are discussed in Vol I; and xii, 1, xiii, 6; xiv belong to the time of Jeremiah, and were written shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, and are discussed in Vol. II,) and Malachi. Ewald now presents in an appendix the later additions to the canon. (1.) The book of Jonah, written, probably, in the course of the 6th or beginning of the 5th century—however the beautiful hymn, Chap. ii, belongs to a much earlier period. (2.) The epistle of Baruch i-iii, and written during the later part of the Persian supremacy. (3.) Baruch iii, 9; v, 9, written about the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemaus I, 320 B. C. (4.) Books of *Daniel* written during the last days of Antiochus Epiphanes, 168-167 B. C.

*Bibel Atlas von Dr. Theo. Menke.* An exceedingly valuable work, which has been long needed. It is a biblical-historical Atlas, on the plan of Spruner's great historical Atlas, a new edition of which is being issued by the same author. It is of great assistance to the student, who would study the Scriptures historically, to have the Holy Land presented in the different periods of its history. The work is fully up to the most recent topographical researches. It is presented as a suitable companion to Herzog's Real Encyc. I. Table of Nations according to various authors and schemes. II. The Northern Semites and the Eastern half of the Mediterranean. III. The Land of the twelve tribes before the exile. IV. Syria and Phœnicia at the time of the Persian empire. V. Judea and the neighboring lands in the time of Christ and the Apostles. VI. Palestine according to the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome. VII. The Holy Land of the Crusaders. VIII. Palestine at present.

*Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie, 4 sehr vermehrte und umgearbeitete Auflage von Dr. CARL SCHWARTZ.* The 3d edition appeared in 1864; since then great changes have taken place in the state of German theology, and these receive the author's attention. The work is a polemic, from the standpoint of the Protestant Association, against the Evangelical Union and the Lutheran churches. He treats of the recent discussion very fully, and in the interest of his party, and devotes an entire chapter to the new lives of Jesus.

"In Dorner and Hengstenberg, the two principles, the *material* and the *formal*, stand in opposition to one another, and in their extreme form." "Dorner has been filled with an idea, which he has followed up with tenacious energy, from his first appearance before the public until the present; that is, the

*sovereign importance of the material principle of the Protestant Church.*" "Hengstenberg has carried on a lifelong conflict for the deification of Scripture Talmudism, and for the annihilation of all free and pure criticism of the canonical Scriptures." He then takes Hengstenberg under his protection as against Dörner. These extreme statements do injustice to both of these distinguished men, who, while they stand on different ground, have never entered the field of controversy directly against each other. Hengstenberg wishes to modify the Protestant doctrine of justification, and employ the *formal* principle; but his main fault is in *advocating grades* in justification. Dörner emphasizes the *material* principle, as did the Reformers of both the great churches; but he would by no means undervalue the *formal* principle. Of the works of Keim, Schwartz speaks in the highest praise. "This book indicates a great advance, and is full o promise." "Now, the real beginning has been made to a true history and treatment of the life of Jesus, in a grand, yet free, style." The new work of Hansrath is also highly commended. The final question arises, "How shall our theology and church be powerful and built up?" "(1.) By a Speculative Theology, free from all pantheistic and atheistic errors, yet strongly opposed to all arbitrary theology, or one belief in miracles. (2.) A Historical-critical Theology. It will establish a historical Christianity in the place of the old dogmatic conceptions of the Scriptures and their inspiration—of Christ and the two natures. (3.) A Religious Moral Theology, rooted in the human soul, it will renew all theology from the true ethical standpoint." "There needs but one man of organizing power, of decided character, to carry on the work of reform, and unite the yet uncorrupted youth about him and lead them in the way of truth."

*Der Brief Pauli an die Römer* von Dr. J. C. von HOFMAN. This theological commentary forms the first section of the third part of his great work upon the New Testament. He has already given to the public the first part with a general statement of the purpose of the work, and his mode of conducting it, and then the epistle to the Thessalonians; the second part, including in the 1st section the epistle to the Galatians, and in the 2d and 3d the two epistles to the Corinthians. He proposes to investigate the New Testament Scriptures in their historical order, each individually, and then to close with a biblical theology, and the history of the formation of the leaven; and then, finally, show the relation of the New Testament to the Old. The methods and peculiarities of von Hofman are well known; his ability and originality are great and unquestioned. His work will be a welcome addition to the exegetical literature of the New Testament.

*Die Clementinischen Schriften mit besonderer Rücksicht auf ihr literarisches Verhältniss* von J. J. LEHMANN. A thorough investigation of these important writings. 1. History of the investigation and its present state. 2. Proof that the *recognitions* in their present condition consist in two chief parts by different authors, e. g., i-iii and iv-x. 3. Critical comparison of the Rec. iv-x, and the corresponding parts of the Homilies, proving that the priority is due to the Homilies—the last seven books of the recognitions being a reproduction, with extracts from them. 4. Comparison of the controversial parts of the Homilies, (iii, 30-58; xvi-xix,) and the reproduction (Rec. i-iii,) and an analysis of the parts peculiar to each recension. 5. The other recensions of the Clementines besides the Homilies and the Recognition.

## ART. X.—NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

## BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

*Bibliorum Sacrorum Græcus Codex Vaticanus, auspice Pio IX. Pontifice Maximo, collatus studiis Caroli Vercellone sodalis Barnabite et Josephi Cozza monachi Basiliani editus. Romæ, typis et impensis s. congregationis de propaganda fide, curante Ego Marietti socio admin. Anno, MDCCCLXVIII. (Tomus V., complectens Novum Testamentum.)* The announcement of this work, as being in course of preparation, was made in a brief programme issued at Rome in March, 1868. The fifth volume (the one first published) has come to hand, exhibiting the text of the New Testament, as now contained in the celebrated Vatican MS. It is printed in *fac simile* (so called), duplicates of the types used in printing the text of the Sinaitic MS. having been obtained for the purpose. A portion of the New Testament now wanting in the ancient MS., by the loss of leaves at the end,\* (namely, the Epistle to the Hebrews from the middle of ch. 9: 14, and the whole of the Apocalypse) is supplied in common Greek type from a later MS. The four Pastoral Epistles, (1 & 2 Tim., Titus, Philem.) also lost from the ancient MS., are not here supplied, as was done by Cardinal Mai in his publication of the text.†

No notes or explanations accompany this volume, except the brief statement, in the index of the books of the New Testament added at the end, that the ancient MS. is defective after Heb. ix. 14, and that the remainder of that epistle is supplied in the Codex by a later hand. The same statement is made respecting the Apocalypse. We have, therefore, no information in regard to this volume, beyond what is given in the programme above referred to.

According to that programme, the work is to be completed in six volumes. The first five will contain the entire text of the MS.; and notes on the text, with other critical apparatus, will be added in a sixth volume. With what fidelity and skill the editors of this great work have executed their delicate and responsible task, we have not yet the means of judging satisfactorily. They promise us the exact text of the MS., *summa fide ad unguem expressum*. But this, as is well known to those conversant with such matters, requires not only diligence and fidelity, but a degree of skill acquired only by long experience. Cardinal Mai's attempt was an ignominious failure.

Prof. Tischendorf's rival publication of the text of this MS. appeared in 1867. Very little opportunity was allowed him of consulting the MS. for this purpose; the Roman Pontiff reserving to himself the honor of at last giving its text to the Christian world, after having so long withheld it, and resisted all attempts of others to make a faithful representation of it. Of the obstacles encountered by Tischendorf, in the execution of his task, we have an interesting account on pp. viii. and following of his *Prolegom. ad Nov. Test. Vat.* He has promised to give us, in an Appendix to that publication, a critical examination of the printed text issued by authority of the Pontiff. It was to be published in October of last year, and is expected by every arrival from Europe. When it comes to hand, we may have occasion to refer to the subject again.

\*The ancient MS. now ends with the letters *καβα* of the word *καβαριελ*, in the midst of the 14th verse of the 9th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The rest of the New Testament (being, in the order observed in the ancient MS., the remaining portion of Heb., 1 and 2 Tim., Tit., Philem., and the Apoc.) is supplied in the Codex by a MS. of the fifteenth century.

†Hebrews, from the last verse of the 9th ch., and Paul's epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, were supplied by him from a MS. of about the 10th century, and the Apocalypse from a MS. of about the 8th century. Of this latter very important MS. Tischendorf published a more correct copy in the "Monumenta Sacra," in 1846, and has promised another, from a still more careful collation of the MS., in the forthcoming Appendix to his edition of the *Codex Vaticanus*.

Meanwhile it must suffice to say, that Tischendorf's long experience in deciphering ancient MSS., and his familiarity with the points in dispute respecting the readings of this one, had prepared him to make the most of the few hours grudgingly allowed him for consulting it. He was thus enabled, by personal inspection, to determine some hundreds of readings, many of which have till now been matters of dispute, and to correct, in a large number of instances, Cardinal Mai's readings of the MS. in one or both of his editions. Of all these, full critical notices are given in pp. xxxiii.—l. of the Commentary prefixed to his publication of the text. Many of them we have examined, in different parts of the New Testament; and in all of these we have found his accuracy attested by the Roman copy before us, the readings claimed by him being there given as those of the MS. A very satisfactory triumph, and well deserved.

It now seems probable that we shall obtain, ere long, a solution of some of the numerous questions respecting the readings of this most important of all the MSS. of the New Testament. It may not be too much to hope, that all these questions will yet be finally settled, by the photolithographic reproduction of the text itself.

T. J. C.

*Appendix Novi Testamenti Vaticani. Inest Apocalypsis ex codice unciali Vaticano 2066, cum supplementis et emendationibus Novi Testamenti Vaticani; item illustratur editio codicis Vaticani Romana nuperrima. Edidit Constantinus Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, Giesecke et Devrient, 1869.* This publication has come to hand since the above notice of the Roman edition of the *Codex Vaticanus* was written. The date, subjoined to the Prolegomena, is December, 1868. It contains the text of the Apocalypse from a MS. of the 7th or 8th century, in the library of the Vatican (*Cod. Bas.* formerly 105, now 2066), already published by Tischendorf in the "*Monumenta Sacra*," in 1846, and now republished from a second and more careful collation made in 1866. It is to be hoped that his promised publication of the text of the *Porphyrian palimpsest*, recently discovered by him, will soon be added to the already greatly enriched apparatus for the text of the Apocalypse.

This publication contains, also, a critical examination of the Roman edition of the *Codex Vaticanus*, followed by corrections of typographical and other errors in Tischendorf's own edition of its text.\* In the following abstract we give the results of his critical examination.

1. The types employed, which are those used in publishing the text of the Sinaitic MS., are too large to represent correctly the size and general appearance of the page in the Vatican MS. The impression from the types is sometimes defective, especially where it is taken in red ink. Of some letters the type itself is occasionally defective. This is especially the case with the small horizontal stroke for *v* final, which is often obscure, and sometimes wholly wanting. The close coherence of letters in the MS. is not properly represented in the printed copy.

2. Unusual spaces between letters, occasionally occurring in the MS., and not carefully expressed in the copy. For example: on p. 36, col. 1, l. 12,† (*Mat. 23: 11*), after the word *ερχονται*, there is an unusual space in the MS., which is not shown in the copy.

3. Typographical errors in single letters, corrected by hand. On p. 173, col. 1, l. 37, in the word *ΑΔΕΛΟΦΥΣ*, the *Δ* is substituted for *Υ*, the erasure of which is very plainly seen in the copy before us. On p. 192 (error for 196), col. 2, l. 34, in *ΑΙΘΙΑΤΜΕΝΟΙ*, the *Ν* is inserted by hand in place of *Μ* erased. Nine other examples, similar to these, are given by Tischendorf, in which typographical errors are thus corrected; not very neatly, as he justly says, but in most of the cases sufficiently so, we think, to escape any but a very practiced eye.

\*It appears, from statements made here, that he was allowed *two and forty* hours for the examination of the MS.; namely, three hours a day between Feb. 28 and March 12, and between the 20th and 26th of March, 1866.

†We give the page, column, and line of the Roman edition. Tischendorf often refers only to the page and line of his own edition.



4. Typographical errors remaining uncorrected; as on p. 15, col. 3, l. 28, *ΠΑΑΤΕΛΑΙΣ* for *ΠΑΑΤΕΛΑΙΣ*; p. 34, col. 3, l. 39, *META* for *META*; p. 228, col. 3, l. 31, *ΔΥNAMEΙ* for *ΔΥNAMEΙ*; all occasioned by the resemblance of *A* to *Δ*. On p. 52, col. 3, l. 2, *Θ* has fallen out in the word *ΙΧΘΥΑΣ*, and on p. 127, col. 1, l. 18, in the word *ΠΟΡΕΥΕΣΘΑΙ*. But in the former case, a trace of the lower part of the letter remains in the copy before us; and in the latter case, only the cross-line of the *Θ* is defectively made in this copy. On p. 229, col. 3, l. 21, the printed copy has *ΕΣΤΙ* where the MS. has *ΕΣΤΙΝ*, the horizontal stroke in the final *ν* being, as Tischendorf states, still quite perceptible in the MS., though very pale.

A curious illustration of the uncertainties of collation, in such minute points, is seen in Tischendorf's reference to p. 124, 8 (error for 28) of his own edition; where, after Mai's example, he edited *μετα ἀλλήλων*, contrary to the received text, the Roman edition having *μετ' ἀλλήλων*, as in the received text. Cardinal Vercellone, in a letter to Tischendorf, had pointed out to him this discrepancy between the MS. and his edition of it, before that of Rome appeared. He said, however, in the same letter, that he found in the MS. *απεκριθης* (John 18: 37), instead of the reading *απεκριθη* given by Tischendorf; and yet the Roman edition has this same reading (p. 143, col. 3, l. 6) without the obnoxious *ς*. But as there is a vacant space of the same width as this letter, which may have dropped out, Tischendorf is hardly justified in hesitating to accept Vercellone's positive testimony in the first instance, on the ground of an imputed inaccuracy in the other.\*

5. Readings of a later hand, instead of those of the original scribe. On p. 54, col. 1, l. 16, (Mark 7: 23.) the original writing is *KOINON*. In the final *N*, a corrector has erased in the MS. the second perpendicular line, and the oblique cross-line, so as to read *KOINOI*. The Roman edition not only gives this emended reading in place of the original one, but is still further unfaithful to the MS., in that it leaves no space, as in the MS., where the erasure was made. On p. 111, col. 2, l. 38 (Luke 22: 65) the Roman edition has *βλασφημουντες*, a correction (by the third hand, as Tischendorf believes) of *βλασφημουντες*. On p. 134, col. 3, l. 42 (John 12: 13) it has the correction *εκραυγαζον*, for the original *εκραυγασαν*; and on p. 227, col. 3, l. 23 (1 Cor. 1: 6) it has *ΧΤ* (in the abbreviation for *χριστου*) for the original *ΘΥ*; the original *Θ* having been erased in the MS. and *Χ* awkwardly substituted. We observe, however, that the *Χ* is not awkwardly expressed in the copy. Eight other examples similar to these are given. In these cases, the editors, instead of giving the original writing of the MS., have given it as subsequently emended, either for the correction of obvious slips of the pen in transcribing, or for critical reasons. Whether so corrected by the original scribe himself, or by some later hand, makes no difference. In either case, the editors do not give us, as promised in their brief programme of last March, *scripturam, quæ ab ipso priori codicis auctore ortum habuit, totidem ac simillimis literarum ductibus*, with subsequent corrections, so far as these can be expressed by types without concealing or confusing the first writing. In other words, they do not give us the *face of the MS.* They may give, as in the above examples, a more correct text than that of the first writing, with its slips of the pen, oversights, and other errors incident to a first draft, as well as mistakes in the earlier exemplar from which it was copied. But the whole written text, as seen on the face of the MS., is what is wanted for critical purposes. With that, the scholar can make his criticisms for himself; and he does not wish his judgment to be forestalled, even in things the most certain. The blunders of a scribe, if at all characteristic, are often important elements in criticism; and inherited defects (so to speak) are invaluable in tracing family relationships among MSS.

6. Want of proper discrimination between the first draft and corrections of the original scribe, and subsequent corrections by other hands.† Of this, ex-

\*Tischendorf's language is: "Quid rei sit 124, 8 [28] non satis scio;" grounding his hesitation on the facts above stated.

†Tischendorf has shown (Prolegom. ad Nov. Test. Vat. p. xvi) that Alford is

amples are given, relating to differences in orthography, in peculiar forms of the same tense (as *εδουατο* and *ηδουατο*, *ηπαδατο* and *ειπαδατο*), in different tenses of the same verb (as *δαριοντε* and *δαριζετε*), and to words added, as *αυτον ζην* [Acts 25: 24] for *αυτον* without *ζην*, the former being, in Tischendorf's opinion, a correction by a second hand, and not by the original scribe.

7. Occasional infelicity in the manner of representing corrections. Where a correction has been made above the line, the printed copy has sometimes a space in the line itself, where none was left by the original scribe. It must be confessed that Tischendorf somewhat exaggerates this defect in his representation of it, making the space considerably wider than in the Roman edition. Still there is occasion for his censure; especially on p. 40, col. 1, l. 26, where the original writing is *ΙΟΜΕΝΗΣ*, and in the vacant space between *ΙΟ* the third corrector has inserted *ΕΝ* in very small characters, to make the correct form *ΙΕΡΟΜΕΝΗΣ*, and where the space improperly left for this insertion, in the Roman copy, falsely indicates an anticipated correction on the part of the original scribe. Of this and similar defects, several other striking examples are given, for which we have not space.

8. Corrections by the third (a very late) hand, given in the copy without the accompanying breathings and accents, which belong to and distinguish them.

From this abstract, which we have purposely made very minute, it will be seen in what respects so competent a critic as Tischendorf has found the Roman copy defective. It is made quite clear, we think, that the Roman editors have aimed to execute their task in good faith. Though not always sufficiently skillful, they evidently have not intended to misrepresent the text of their noble MS. They have given us substantially its text; erring sometimes in anticipating the results of criticism instead of furnishing material for it, sometimes from want of due care in very minute though not unimportant points, and sometimes from want of sufficient skill in palaeography, in which Tischendorf's long and varied experience has made him preëminent. His comments on the failure to exhibit by types the minute peculiarities of the MS., so often essential to a correct critical judgment, prove the desirableness and necessity of a more accurate mode of representing it. The very face of the MS. should be so exhibited, that it may be accessible to scholars of every country; and that the text itself may be perpetuated to future ages, when the material of the MS. shall have mouldered to dust. This can be done only by the photolithographic process, already so successfully applied to portions of other MSS. T. J. C.

*A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians.* By JOHN EADIE, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Co. 1869. 8vo, pp. LXIII. 480. The object, form and style of this Commentary are similar to those of the author's works on Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians. The one aim has been to ascertain the meaning through a careful analysis of the words. No grammatical or lexical investigation has been spared and no labor grudged in the attempt to illustrate an epistle which contains so vivid an outline of evangelical truth. After determining the sense of the text, the author seeks to unfold it in a lucid and harmonious fullness. While familiar with the labors of all who have preceded him, and availing himself, at times, of the results of their investigations and criticisms, his Commentary will take high rank as an independent and scholarly production, written in a catholic and evangelical spirit, evincing an earnest and honest attempt to discover the mind of the Spirit as revealed in this part of God's word, and embodying the results of much learned, sound, and valuable criticism. The text is, mainly, the seventh edition of Tischendorf, to whom we are indebted for the Codex Sinaiticus, and for his recent and exact edition of the Vatican Codex of the New Testament, a very interesting notice of which will be found in this

---

specially chargeable with the error of confounding subsequent corrections with those of the first scribe.

REVIEW from the pen of Dr. Conant, whose efforts to secure photolithographic copies of this celebrated and invaluable MS. are deserving of all praise.

*Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter.* By the REV. JOHN LILLIE, D. D. With an Introduction by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. 8vo, pp. 536. Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. The author had carefully prepared the MS. of the present work for the press, previous to his lamented death, and it is now given to the public precisely as he left it. His former Commentaries on various epistles has established his reputation as one of the best classical and biblical scholars in this country. Dr. Schaff, in his Introduction—than whom no scholar or critic among us is better competent to express a judgment—gives the work a very high character. It breathes the reverential spirit and devotional fervor of Leighton's immortal work, while far more thorough and full as an exposition, and has the great advantage of embodying the most valuable results of the latest critical research and exegetical learning. "Beyond all other merits," says Dr. Schaff, "these Lectures will be valued for their clear and uncompromising, yet always devout, testimony to the doctrines of grace. They are exhibited, not as blighting speculations, but as warm, living, practical realities. Here, in a day of many wide defections from the old paths, is the voice of a trumpet giving no uncertain sound, to summon the scattered hosts back to 'the good old way.'" If the students of the Bible do not come to understand its sense and master the sources of its illustrations, it will not be for lack of numerous and excellent helps.

*A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, prepared as a Solid Basis for the Interpretation of the New Testament.* By DR. GEORGE BENEDICT WINER. Seventh edition, enlarged and improved by Dr. Gottlieb Lüneman, Professor of Theology at the University of Göttingen. Revised and authorized translation. 8vo., pp. 744. Andover: W. F. Draper, 1869. This standard work contains the last revisions of its distinguished author, edited with filial care by Dr. Lüneman, a former pupil of Dr. Winer, and is presented in a translation by Professor Thayer, of Andover, as strictly literal as is consistent with the English language. It is also furnished with an Index of Principal Subjects, a Greek Index, and a Complete Index of Scripture Passages, in which those passages simply referred to and those commented upon are distinguished: thus furnishing at once a Grammar and a Commentary on the New Testament. Figures are so arranged in the margin that any reference to either the sixth or seventh German editions or to Masson's English translation, can be readily found in this edition. This feature will be of great service, since each of these several editions is referred to or quoted by different authors. Great pains also have been taken to secure typographical accuracy, an extremely difficult thing in a work of this kind. We rejoice that so invaluable a work has thus been made as nearly perfect as we can hope ever to have it. It is a work that can hardly fail to facilitate and increase the reverent and accurate study of the Word of God. Mr. Draper deserves no little praise and success for the standard character of the works which the Andover press produces.

*Jesus of Nazareth, His Life and Teachings: Founded on the Four Gospels and illustrated by Reference to the Manners, Customs, Religious Beliefs, and Political Institutions of His Times.* By LYMAN ABBOTT. Harper & Brothers 12mo., pp. 522. The appearance of so many new works on Christ is a favorable sign of the times. It indicates a fresh spirit of inquiry in relation to the one historic character of the world. They are so various also in purpose, and structure, and form of argument, as to meet the demands of all classes of minds. We have here a new, and, in some of its features, a most admirable and valuable life of Jesus of Nazareth. The author assumes the inspiration of the Gospels and the credibility of miracles, and hence acts not the part of the critic or the philosopher. Nor does he treat the subject theologically, or seek to eulogize the teachings or character of Christ. The general purpose of the book has been to gather up the single threads of Jesus's history, as

they lie, without order or system, in the several gospels, and weave them into a connected narrative, "to learn, if possible, the course of His earthly life, the order of His ministry, the gradual unfolding of His divine purposes, and the secret causes which so operated on the public mind as to lead the people to offer Him a crown in Galilee and award him the cross at Jerusalem,"—in a word, to construct an historical harmony. To give due significance to the life and teachings of Christ, the author sketches the times and surroundings of the Great Teacher. He also seeks to trace the stream of Christian civilization to its source, "to study in the life and teachings of Jesus the Christianity of Christ." On the whole, the important task we judge to be well executed. The work is eminently biblical. It is also popular, and yet it is not superficial. It is the result of much careful study, and it can not fail to be useful. The illustrations are unusually fine, and the publishers have given it a very attractive appearance.

*The Evidences of Christianity, with an Introduction on the Existence of God and the Immortality of the Soul.* By EBENEZER DODGE, D. D., President of Madison University. Gould & Lincoln. 12mo., pp. 244. The substance of this volume was originally delivered as lectures to the students of Madison University. The governing idea of the author in the preparation of it is, that Christianity is its own witness. The nature of Christianity, its influence, its relations to Divine Providence and to human progress, and its historical triumphs, constitute the best evidence of its divine origin. This method is philosophical, since all the great lines of evidence are wrought into the fabric of our faith, or touch some of the many aspects of human life and history. The scope of the book is therefore restricted to the field of Christian apologetics. The author has aimed to present Christianity as accepted by the representatives of the Protestant faith. The work is executed in a candid spirit and with fair ability. The style is simple and the argument perspicuous, and brought within moderate limits. It aims not at originality of argument or statement, and adds nothing, perhaps, to the mass of evidence already accumulated.

#### CHURCH HISTORY AND THEOLOGY.

*Ante-Nicene Christian Library.* Edited by REV. A. ROBERTS, D. D., and JAMES DONALDSON, LL. D. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. 1869. Vols. IX and X. This invaluable series is published in an excellent style. No recent work of the kind has had so much success,—which is due in part to its execution, and, in part to its influence in bringing us to see what Christianity was as found in the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries. These two volumes are among the most noteworthy of the series. The first of them contains "The Writings of Irenæus, vol. 2," translated by Dr. Roberts, and the Rev. W. H. Rambant, containing the conclusion of Irenæus' noble defense of the Faith against Heretics, (Books IV and V) with Fragments from the Last Writings of Irenæus; and the "Extant Works and Fragments of Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, and Martyr," which have been so fully discussed in the recent theological literature. The other volume is devoted to Origen—containing his Treatise De Principiis, etc. The translations are good. More of literary references might well be added. Scribner, Welford & Co., New York, are the American agents for this important and valuable Library.

*Annals of the American Pulpit.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Vol. IX. Robert Carter & Brothers.—It rarely falls to the lot of any one man to accomplish successfully a task like that which Dr. Sprague has undertaken in his "Annals of the American Pulpit," and which he has brought so nearly to triumphant completion. This ninth volume of the series contains Sketches of a large number of the leading divines of the Lutheran, Reformed Dutch, Associate, Associate Reformed, and Reformed Presbyterian churches in this country. Some of these bodies, though small in point of numbers, have produced men of marked ability, who have exerted a permanent and important influence upon the religious history of this country, and their names would do honor to any branch

of the church. It must suffice to mention here the two Muhlenburgs, Schaeffer, Schmucker, Kurtz and Harking, of the Lutheran church; Frelinghuysen, Hardenbergh, Laidlie, Romeyn, Livingston, Linn, Abeel and Milledoler, of the Reformed Dutch; and Gellatly, Anderson, Marshall, the Proudfts, the Masons, Gray, Kerr, Duncan, McLeod, Wylie, and McMaster, of the smaller Presbyterian bodies. In all, we have in this volume over 180 biographical sketches of distinguished clergymen, and the materials of these sketches have been secured, in many cases, only by great effort and persevering diligence.

As a contribution to the history of the several branches of the Church of Christ in this country, these sketches are invaluable, and the entire series will henceforth be accounted indispensable to the student of our ecclesiastical affairs. Nor should it be forgotten that these records present us with individual portraits of character, which invite our study, and examples of devotion, and often of self-denial, which are at once instructive and inspiring.

*The Being of God, Moral Government, and Theses in Theology.* By MILES P. SQUIER, D. D., late Professor of Intellectual Philosophy, Beloit, Wisconsin. Rochester: Darrow & Kempshall. 12mo., pp. 247. The principal writings of Dr. Squier are "The Problem Solved," published in 1855; "Reason and the Bible" (passed to a third edition) in 1860; and his "Autobiography and Miscellaneous Writings" in 1867, one year after his death. The present volume is the last that will appear. It was committed by the author on his death-bed to the charge of the editor, Rev. James R. Boyd, for revision and publication. The first part of it, treating with great acumen and originality upon the being of God, was given to the press by the author himself, a few weeks before his death, and appeared soon after in the *Presbyterian and Theological Review*. The author's views of moral government are, in some respects, antagonistic to those commonly held; and whether they will ever be generally adopted, as the author so confidently believed they would be, or not, there can be no doubt as to the value of the book as a means of mental discipline, and as suggestive of important thoughts. Dr. Squier was extensively known as a clear, original, and vigorous thinker. Fond of logical and abstruse thought, and making the science of theology the study of his life, his writings are worthy of careful study. Very positive in his opinions, bold and independent in his reasonings, and fond of close and sharp intellectual conflicts, one can not always agree with him, or read him with philosophical calmness. But his writings will set the reader's mind a-thinking, at least, if they do not convince. Part I., on the Being of God, forms a fitting introduction to the treatise on Moral Government. His "Theses in Theology," forming part of the volume, are reprinted from his *Miscellaneous Writings*.

#### SCIENCE AND HISTORY.

*Primeval Man: An Examination of some Recent Speculations.* By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. New York: George Routledge & Son, 1869. 16mo., pp. 200.

*Pre-Historic Nations; or Inquiries Concerning some of the Great Peoples and Civilizations of Antiquity, and their probable Relation to a still older Civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia.* By JOHN D. BALDWIN, A.M. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869. 12mo., pp. 414. Both of these works go over substantially the same ground, and, to a very considerable extent, reach the same general conclusion. How far the latter work has been suggested and moulded by the former, which has been before the public for some little time in the pages of *Good Words*, it is not for us to say. But the tone and spirit of the two works are very unlike. The first is simply argumentative, cautious and modest in its conclusions, and reverent and conservative in its spirit. The other is a very pretentious book, with quite as much assertion as proof, very oracular in all its judgments and positive in its conclusions, and full of an ill-concealed hostility to the teachings of Revelation and to "orthodox" scholarship, whenever they come into conflict with his opinions. The work is inscribed to the American Oriental Society, of which the author is a member. Its main object is to establish the great antiquity of man upon the



earth. At the outset he scouts the received "biblical" chronologies as worthless. "Any system of chronology that places the creation of man only 4,000 or 5,000 years previous to the birth of Christ, is a mere invention, a scholastic fancy, an elaborate absurdity. There is nothing to warrant it and not much to excuse it. Those who profess to find it in the Bible, misuse and falsify that book." Such is the modesty of the class of scientific writers to which our author belongs. All the scholarship of the past—quite as profound, accurate and reliable as the present day can boast of—is not, by such oracles, "to be treated with the smallest degree of respect." He claims that geology and linguistic science compel us to "throw off the trammels of these false chronologies," so as to afford us "room in the past for those great pre-historic developments of civilization, and those long pre-historic ages of human activity and enterprise, which are indicated by the oldest monuments, records, and mythologies." While not treating on geology at all, he asserts that it forces us to abandon "biblical" chronology and assign a very remote antiquity to man. But where is the evidence from *geology* to establish his conclusions? Is there any certain reliable data, accepted by geologists themselves, as establishing the fact of a very remote antiquity to man? A few years since a certain class of scientific men asserted that man had lived on the earth many thousands of years before Adam, and Lyell fixed the period at 244,000 years. But more recently there has been a marked tendency to greater caution and doubt, in stating these conclusions, while Dr. Praff, the author of the latest German treatise on the pre-historic earth, declares there is no evidence to fix the age of the human race at over 7,000 years.

By "pre-historic times" the "author means the ages between the creation of man and the beginning of authentic history. This compels us to reject the usual method, and, going back of the Greeks and Romans, allow an immense period for the growth of Egyptian, Chinese, and Ethiopian civilizations and dominions, as they are shown to have existed in monuments and linguistic science long prior to their advent. But what is more uncertain than the data furnished by these two sources? Nothing as yet is proved here. The ruins of Egypt and Chaldea, as opened and deciphered by modern research and scholarship, marvellously confirm rather than contradict the Bible history of man. The author expresses himself in his usual sweeping style when he affirms: "It is as certain as anything else in ancient history, that Egypt existed as a civilized country not less than 5,000 years earlier than the birth of Christ. Yet seven centuries before Abraham—or 2,800 years B.C.—is the estimate of Mr. Pool, of the British Museum, as cited by the Duke of Argyll, and who affirms "that he is one of the very highest authorities upon questions of Egyptian chronology"—for the founding of the Egyptian monarchy. According to Usher's chronology, this would be some 400 years beyond the flood. But there is a difference of 800 years, according to the chronology founded upon the Septuagint version, which would place the event 400 years after the flood. So he claims a great antiquity for the Chinese. The authentic records of the Chinese Empire are said to begin in the twenty-fourth century B.C.—more than 300 years before the time of Abraham, and that even then the kingdom was already established, with a capital city, and with a settled government. But the Rev. James Legge, who has spent many years as a missionary in China, and has published valuable editions of the historical works of the Chinese, gives it as his opinion, as cited by the Duke of Argyll, "that the Chinese tribe was only beginning to grow into a kingdom about 2,000 B.C., and that 1,200 years later the kingdom did not extend nearly so far south as the Yang-tze river." But the author claims that the Cushite or Ethiopian people antedate all others and were the centre and source of an earlier civilization. But our space will not allow us to follow him in this line of argument. The evidence at best is vague and presumptive.

The candor and caution, so marked in the Duke of Argyll's book, at once conciliates the critic. Part I, introductory, is a defence of Dr. Whately's "Origin of Civilization," against a paper read at the meeting of the British As-



sociation in 1867, by Sir J. Lubbock, upon "The Early Condition of Mankind." II. Treats of the Origin of Man, in which he vigorously combats all the theories of development, not on theological but scientific grounds. III. Treats of the Antiquity of Man. IV. Of Man's Primitive Condition, in which he reasons with great point and force against the idea that the primeval condition of man was one of barbarism.

As to man's antiquity, the drift of his argument is in favor of a longer period than that usually assigned to man. Chronology, he says, is of two kinds—time measured by years, which he calls time-absolute, and time measured by an ascertained order of succession of events, which he calls time-relative. "Now, among all the sciences which afford us evidence on the antiquity of man, one, and one only, gives us any knowledge of time-absolute; and that is history. From all others we can gather only the less definite information of time-relative. They can tell us of nothing more than of the order in which certain events took place. But of the length of interval between those events, neither archæology, nor geology, nor ethnology, can tell us anything. . . . No other history than the Hebrew history even professes to go back to the Creation of Man or to give any account of the events which connect existing generations with the first progenitor of their race. And of that history the sole object appears to be to give in outline the order of such transactions as had a special bearing on religious truth. The intimations given in the earlier chapters of Genesis on all matters of purely secular interest, are incidental only, and exceedingly obscure, and yet it is not a total silence. Enough is said to indicate how much there lay beyond and outside of the narrative which is given." From history, from archæology, from the science of language, and from geology, according to our author, "we can not fail to see that the proofs of a very high antiquity for the human race, are proofs of a cumulative character, gathered along several different paths of investigation, and all tending to one general result." That result, however, is necessarily indefinite, and can not be expressed in years.

His closing remarks are sensible and to the purpose. "For my part I see no reason to be jealous of the conclusions of science in this matter. The question is, after all, a small one. It is a question of a few thousand years, more or less, and thousands of years are less than seconds in the Creative Days. . . . Man is the latest work. Recent discoveries have thrown no doubt on this, but, on the contrary, have tended to confirm it. I know of no one moral or religious truth which depends on a short estimate of man's antiquity. On the contrary, a high estimate of that antiquity is of great value in its bearings upon another question, much more important than the question of time can ever be, viz., the question of the Unity of the Human Race. We must, indeed, be very cautious in identifying the interests of religion with any interpretation (however certain we may hitherto have assumed it to be) of the language of Scripture upon subjects which are accessible to scientific research. We know from past experience how foolish and how futile it is to do so. But unquestionably the unity of the human race, in respect to origin, is not easily separated from some principles which are of high value in our understanding, both of moral and religious truth. And precisely as we value our belief in that unity, ought we to be ready and willing to accept any evidence on the question of man's antiquity. The older the human family can be proved to be, the more possible and probable it is that it has descended from a single pair. My own firm belief is that all scientific evidence is in favor of this conclusion; and I regard all new proofs of the antiquity of man as tending to establish it on a firm basis."

*Chips from a German Workshop.* By MAX MULLER, M. A., Fellow of All Soul's College, Oxford. 2 vols. New York: C. Scribner & Co., 1869. 12mo., pp. xxxiii., 374, 402. The queer title of this work was suggested by Bunsen, more than twenty years ago, when informing the author of the success of his efforts to induce the East India Company to publish the "Rig-veda," on which

he was engaged. "Now," he said, "you have got a work for life—a large block that will take you years to plane and polish. But mind, let us have from time to time some chips from your workshop." He has followed this advice of his friend, and, from time to time, ever since, has published articles, in various English quarterlies and monthlies, as well as in the *Saturday Review*, *Times*, and *Oxford Essays*, on various collateral subjects, while prosecuting at the same time his edition of the "Rig-veda," and other Sanskrit works connected with it. Having at length completed this great work, he "gathers up a few armfuls of these chips and splinters," and presents them to the public in these volumes, which contain "essays on the early thoughts of mankind, whether religious or mythological, and on early traditions and customs." The author confesses to an absorbing passion for tracing the origin and first growth of human thought, not in accordance with the Hegelian laws of thought or the Comtean epochs, but historically. His central idea is, that the growth of language and religion is continuous, and that by pushing our researches back to the remotest times, the very elements and roots of human speech, and of the religions of the world, may be reached. In all religions he claims to have found these radical elements: "An intuition of God, a sense of human weakness and dependence, a belief in the Divine government of the world, a distinction between good and evil, and a hope of a better life." If these had not "formed a part of the original dowry of the human soul, religion itself would have remained an impossibility." The conclusions reached by the learned author, in this wide and interesting field of investigation, utterly falsify Darwin's Development theory, and the speculations of all who contend that man's primeval state was one of barbarism. "As far as we can trace back the footsteps of man, even on the lowest strata of history, we see that the divine gift of a sound and sober intellect belonged to him from the very first; and the idea of a humanity emerging slowly from the depths of an animal brutality can never be maintained again. The earliest work of art wrought by the human mind—more ancient than any literary document, and prior even to the first whisperings of tradition—the human language, forms an uninterrupted chain from the first dawn of history down to our own times. We still speak the language of the first ancestors of our race; and this language, with its wonderful structure, bears witness against such gratuitous imputations. The formation of language, the composition of roots, the gradual discrimination of meanings, the systematic elaboration of grammatical forms—all this working which we can still see under the surface of our speech, attests from the very first the presence of a rational mind—of an artist as great, at least, as his work." The same line of argument he pursues, and with the same result, in regard to the religions of mankind.

The investigation and discussion take a very wide range. Vol. I. is made up of essays on the Science of Religion, in which the author passes in review the chief systems of religious faith in the world, and gives a full and highly interesting review of the sacred writings of each. Vol. II. is devoted chiefly to the Mythological and Legendary lore of the world.

We have not space to go into particulars in the matter of criticism. Some of the author's views on the science of religion are open to serious objections. The gist of his theory may be gathered from a quotation he makes from Augustine, giving his words the widest possible latitude. "What is now called the Christian religion has existed among the ancients, and was not absent from the beginning of the human race, until Christ came in the flesh: from which time the true religion, which existed already, began to be called Christian." But, in conclusion, he remarks: "The science of religion is only just beginning, and we must take care how we impede its progress by pre-conceived notions or too hasty generalizations. During the last fifty years the authentic documents of the most important religions of the world have been recovered in a most unexpected and almost miraculous manner. We have now before us the canonical books of Buddhism; the Zend-Avesta of Zoroaster is no longer a sealed book; and the hymns of the Rig-veda have

revealed a state of religion anterior to the first beginnings of that mythology which, in Homer and Hesiod, stands before us in a mouldering ruin. The soil of Mesopotamia has given back the very images once worshipped by the most powerful of the Semitic tribes, and the cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon and Nineveh have discovered the very prayers addressed to Baal or Nisroch. With the discovery of these documents a new era begins in the study of religion. We begin to see more clearly every day what St. Paul meant in his sermon at Athens."

*The History of Civilization.* By AMOS DEAN, LL. D. In Seven Volumes. Vol. II. Albany: Joel Munsell. 1869. 8vo. Pp. 533. The style in which this history is produced is worthy of all praise. It is a luxury to read it—so finely toned is the paper, and so clear and perfect the type. Of the literary execution of the work we have already expressed a favorable judgment on the appearance of the first volume. The plan is a very broad and comprehensive one—too much so for any one man to do full justice to all the parts of it. But the two volumes now published evince admirable qualities in the author—for the work undertaken—extensive research, a conscientious regard for the truth, the power to digest and put in order the vast materials at his command, and a knowledge of the various speculations and philosophies which bear upon the subject. His mind was practical rather than theoretical; and hence we have a *history* rather than a *philosophy* of history. And the work is the more valuable for this reason.

The present volume is entirely occupied with Greece. I. Its Description and History. II. Its Industry. III. Its Religion. IV. Its element of Society. V. Its Government. VI. Its Philosophy. VII. Its Art. This is a fruitful and, to the classical reader especially, highly interesting field for investigation, and while it may not greatly add to his stock of knowledge, it clearly arranges and methodizes and makes available his knowledge of the subject. The work deserves, and we trust will receive, favorable attention.

*China and the Chinese.* A General Description of the Country and its Inhabitants; its Civilization and Form of Government; its Religious and Social Institutions; its Intercourse with other Nations, and its Present Condition and Prospects. By the Rev. JOHN L. NEVIUS. Harper & Brothers. 12mo, pp. 456. Since China has become our neighbor, and is brought into new and more intimate social and commercial relations with us, we ought to feel a new interest in that vast and ancient Empire, and acquaint ourselves more thoroughly with its history, and literature, and social and religious life. And no testimony is so reliable as that furnished by resident foreigners, who have rare opportunities to study that strange people in the various phases of their being, especially if, as in the case of the missionary, they have no motive to conceal or exaggerate the truth. The author of this book has spent ten years of missionary life in China in connection with the Presbyterian Board, so that he is prepared to write intelligently on the subject. The book is crowded with facts, and the results of close and patient and extended observation, and treats on all those topics about which we are most concerned to know. Not since the appearance of William's "Middle Kingdom" have we had a more valuable book in the matter of definite and reliable information. It adds another to the many valuable contributions which modern missions have made, bearing on the learning, commerce, and general interests of the world.

*A Modern Historical Atlas for the use of Colleges, Schools, and General Readers.* By REV. WILLIAM GAGE, translator of "Ritter's Palestine," etc. D. Appleton & Co. The object of this work is to convey to the eye the civil divisions of the chief countries of the world during the course of modern history. We think Mr. Gage, who has made the study of geography a specialty, has succeeded admirably in the design. By means of these several maps, only in outline, the student will readily catch a view of the leading civil divisions of nations at the various epochs of modern history. The maps are elegantly prepared, and substantially bound in book-form, so as to be convenient for reference.

## PRACTICAL RELIGION.

*Sermons preached before the University of Oxford.* By H. P. LIDDON, M. A. Third Edition, revised. London: Rivingtons. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 12mo, pp. XVI, 350. The Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ, by this same author, were an eminent success, and at once established his reputation as a thinker and writer of no mean parts. This volume of Sermons is uniform in style with the volume containing his Bampton Lectures. Besides the Preface, it contains thirteen Sermons, having no particular connection, three of which were not in the previous editions. The themes of these Sermons are important, such as "God and the Soul," "The Law of Progress," "The Freedom of the Spirit," "Immortality," "The Conflict of Faith with undue exaltation of Intellect," "The Divine Victim," "The Risen Life," "Faith in a Holy Ghost," "The Divine Indwelling a Motive to Holiness," etc. The Sermons are eminently characterized by vigor of thought, elegance of diction, earnestness of purpose, and the highest elements of instruction.

*Hades and Heaven; or, What does Scripture reveal of the Estate and Employments of the Blessed Dead, and of the Risen Saints.* By REV. E. H. BICKERSTETH. Carter & Brothers. The first of the essays which compose this beautiful little volume—the State of the Blessed Dead before the Resurrection—has already been published. The author adopts the "intermediate state" theory, and endeavors to establish and fix its leading features from the Scriptures. The other essay discusses the estate and employment of the Risen Saints in the light of biblical teaching, and in a manner that can not fail to animate the Christian's faith and make him long for that glorious period to come. This period embraces not only the heavenly period, but also the millennium, according to the author's view. And, indeed, he restricts his remarks almost entirely to the millennial state, and here we think is the great defect of the treatise. Why the author should assume that *angels are without bodies*, we can not understand. It is contrary to all analogy and Scripture implication. In all the instances on record in which angels appeared to men, they appeared in *bodily* form. God alone, it seems to us, is pure spirit. If saints have bodies in glory, why not angels? What incongruous elements will mingle in the society and life of heaven if the one have bodies and the other not?

*The Day Dawn and the Rain, and other Sermons.* By the REV. JOHN KER, Glasgow, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1869. 12mo., pp. 450. The author of these sermons is regarded with affectionate sympathy by those who were wont to listen to the eloquent preacher with admiration and delight, but whose manly, persuasive voice has been seldom heard in the pulpit for years past, by reason of sore affliction. For this reason this volume will be highly welcome in the wide circle of his personal friends and admirers. But it has a value and an interest for the universal church. Mr. Ker furnishes evidence, in these sermons, of possessing genius of a high order, in rare combination with eminent wisdom and goodness. He displays great compass and exquisite balance of mental powers, all enriched by a high and varied culture. He has a glowing imagination, a clear understanding, a sound judgment, a warm heart, the logical faculty in large degree, and an intense sympathy with the true, the beautiful, and the good. The discourses—twenty-four in number—embrace a wide range and diversity of subjects, some of which are out of the ordinary course of pulpit ministrations. They all revolve, however, around the central truth of the gospel—Christ crucified. Several of the sermons traverse the higher paths of Christian and philosophic research, and with no little ability. But the greater part of them are devoted to topics intimately connected with daily Christian faith and practice. The style is in harmony with the varying thought—luminous, vigorous, often elegant, often deepening into tender pathos, or rising into true eloquence. The sermons, as a whole, must take rank among the best that the English or Scottish pulpit has produced in the present generation.

ART. XI.—THEOLOGICAL, AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.  
GERMANY.

The following notes on German Universities, Theological Academies, and recent books. are from an American student now studying in Berlin.

## STATISTICS OF THE GERMAN UNIVERSITIES, SUMMER OF 1868.

Country.	University.	Theological.		Total.		Theological Tendencies.
		Prof.	Students.	Prof.	Students.	
Prussia,	Berlin,	17	335	178	2997	Evangelical Union. (E. U.)
"	Halle,	12	316	81	859	Evangelical Union.
"	Göttingen,	11	157	110	824	Moderate Lutheran.
"	Bonn,	15	242	102	939	E. U. & Rom. Cath. 2 faculties
"	Breslau,	15	228	89	923	R. C. & E. U. 2 faculties.
"	Königsberg	8	83	69	448	Evangelical Union.
"	Marburg,	7	74	61	365	Evangelical Union.
"	Kiel,	4	56	44	223	Moderate Lutheran.
"	Greifswald,	5	31	56	442	Evangelical Union.
"	Münster,	8	229	25	444	Roman Catholic.
"	Braunsberg	4	36	8	48	Roman Catholic.
N. Ger. Bund,	Leipsic,	11	340	122	1345	Strict & Mod. Lutheran, div'd.
"	Jena,	8	122	62	432	Semi Rational. & E. U. (div'd.)
"	Giessen,	6	38	59	314	Evangelical Union.
"	Rostock,	4	47	36	190	Strict Lutheran.
Baden,	Heidelberg	7	73	110	780	Rationalistic.
"	*Freiburg,	—	52	47	307	Roman Catholic.
Wurtemberg,	Tübingen,	13	410	73	845	Mod. Luth. & R. C. 2 faculties.
Bavaria,	Erlangen,	8	221	46	392	Strict Lutheran.
"	Würzburg,	6	67	57	565	Roman Catholic.
"	Munich,	10	107	124	127	Roman Catholic.
Russia,	Dorpat,	7	68	58	595	Strict Lutheran.
Switzerland,	*Basel,	—	45	51	93	Reformed.
"	Berne,	8	23	70	202	Reformed.
"	*Zurich,	—	34	68	177	Rationalistic.
Austria,	Vienna,	—	—	191	3074	R. C. & a small E. U. faculty.
"	Prague,	9	259	93	1442	Roman Catholic.
"	*Innspruch—	139	50	391		Roman Catholic.
"	*Graz,	—	95	54	554	Roman Catholic.

## REMARKS.

The figures in this table are taken from the new *Academische Zeitschrift*. The universities marked \* are estimated from previous returns—the others are given as they are now reported.

There is some change in the number of students during the winter months. Berlin falls off in summer and gains in winter. This winter there are 335 theological students, and 2997 in all the Faculties.

In most of the universities there are distinguished Professors who deviate from the general tendency of the University. In Berlin, Prof. Hengstenberg, and in Halle, Prof. Guericke, are strong Lutherans. In Leipsic, the moderate Lutherans are Lechler, Tischendorf, Brückner, and Fricke; these and the moderate Lutherans of the Tübingen faculty, and some in Göttingen and other Universities, are in sympathy with the Evangelical Union party. In Rostock, Prof. Baumgarten belongs to the Protestant Association. There are no members of this Association in the theological faculties of Berlin, Halle, Leipsic, Erlangen, or Tübingen.

The Centennial of the birth of Schleiermacher was celebrated on the 21st of November in many German universities. Prof. Twisten delivered the address in Berlin. Prof. Moluck in Halle, Prof. Kahn in Leipsic, and Dr. Schenkel in Heidelberg. The Protestant Association endeavored to make capital out of the occasion, but they have made a great failure. The great Schleiermacher is justly estimated, in some respects, as the chief of a more positive tendency,



as renewing the vital faith of the Reformation. The numerous addresses and articles by the right men, will effectually counteract all the aims of Schenkel and his party. [In this country, the only public recognition of this centennial, was an interesting and cordial address by Samuel Osgood, of New York, correctly representing Schleiermacher as redeeming Christian theology from the fetters of an abstract and illusive rationalism, and as planting it on a positive and firm basis, both in history and experience. R. Baxmann, of the University of Bonn, has prefaced an interesting popular sketch of the Life of Schleiermacher (pp. 160—with a very poor portrait); a fuller life is in preparation, by W. Dilthey, to be issued by Reimer, Berlin, the publisher of the works of Schleiermacher, and his life-long friend.]

There are three great church parties in Protestant Germany, contending for the supremacy.

1. The party of the Protestant Association, whose leader is Schenkel in Heidelberg: its principal organ, the *Allgemeine Kirch Zeitschrift*. The aim of this party is to establish a universal German Church, with perfect freedom in doctrine and preaching, without any confessional restrictions. Here are gathered all shades of opinion, united only in this common purpose, (a) the strict Rationalists, (b) the great middle body, who attempt to construct the church and theology on pure ethical principles, denying the divinity of Christ and the supernatural, (c) a few men, such as Baumgarten in Rostock, who are more positive and believing, but who desire freedom from confessional and ecclesiastical restrictions. They seek to influence men of culture and the people; they give themselves out as the true Protestants, the successors, in a general way, of Luther and Calvin,—the disciples of Schleiermacher. They are like the American Unitarians, or "Liberal Christians," and embrace the same mixture of elements. It is not at all likely that they will gain much success in producing a reaction in Germany. Heidelberg, the only university in Germany representing this tendency, is constantly falling off in students, having this winter only forty-five theological students: it can not at all contend with its evangelical neighbors, Tübingen and Bonn, not to speak of the great northern universities. They make great pretensions and are very active, but really accomplish very little.

2. The Lutherans. Their object is to preserve and extend the Lutheran church in its distinctive features, carefully and sharply excluding all Calvinistic and Melancthonian elements. Erlangen and Rostock are the strongholds of this party, whilst Leipzig, with such men as Luthardt, Kahnis, and Delitzsch, give it strong support. There are also representatives of this party in many of the other universities. This party is also made up of various elements, although it is essentially *reactionary*. (a) A small branch, headed by Hengstenberg and Kliefoth, reach toward Romanism, and may be regarded as the Puseyites of Germany. (b) The middle party reach toward Lutheran scholasticism, and wish to restore the strict Lutheran orthodoxy. They would base themselves strictly on the *Formula Concordia*. (c) A third section desire a distinctive but progressive Lutheranism. This branch has the leadership at present, as it is necessary to unite all the elements. They have started a new organ, the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, under the editorship of Luthardt. This was resolved upon at the last conference at Hanover.

They desire a national German Lutheran church, if possible, in accordance with the traditional *territorialism*—if not a national Lutheran church independent of the state. This party is strong in the number of its theologians, but it does not address and can not reach the people—it will not produce a new life in the religion of Germany—it is opposed to *lay* influence. It may gain strength for a while, but it can not succeed.

3. The Evangelical Union Party. Within this party are comprised almost all these men, who, recognizing and valuing the struggles of the past century, contend on the one hand against Rationalism, and on the other against a return to Protestant Scholasticism. Naturally there are men of great variety of views with respect to the great questions of the day in the ranks of this party—but they would all admit and contend for the divinity of Christ and the supernatural in the Scriptures. They advocate *Union* on the fundamental principles of the Reformation as contained in the Augsburg Confession, allowing a difference



of interpretation on the disputed points between Lutherans and Calvinists; they hold fast to the Augsburg Confession as *invariata* or *variata*,—the original Confession, or the Confession as afterward altered by Melancthon. A living faith in Christ the Redeemer,—the faith of Luther and Calvin and Schleiermacher, is the bond of union. Naturally, the men of this party are approaching nearer and nearer one another. The Reformed (Calvinists) have abandoned strict Calvinistic Predestination—the Lutherans, the strict Lutheran Consubstantiation; and the men of this party are very nearly agreed on these points. This was shown by a conference held in Berlin, in October last, by the men of this party. Dorner, Tholuck, Julius Müller, and Lange are the great men of this party. Evangelical Protestant Union is the main thing with them. The men of this tendency have a hard battle to fight, placed between the two extremes of Rationalism and Reaction. The church must return to a past scholastic age, or advance in the path of Evangelical Protestant progress. That these men will gain the day we feel assured: (a) from their sympathy with the spirit of the times, which is for Union. The period of disintegration has passed, the period of integration is in progress in church and state. (b) They are in sympathy with the vital principles of the Reformation and the needs of the times. They are more and more active in evangelization. The Sunday-school movement, started by an American, Mrs. Woodruff, is assuming greater dimensions, recommended by the *Oberkirchenrath*, the highest church authority, to all the churches of Prussia, it has increased fifty per cent. during the past year. City missions are springing up—started by some Scotch students, who have gained a decided success. The great benevolent institutions are in the hands of this party, under such men as Dr. Wichern. The Gustavus Adolphus Association, for the support of Protestants in Catholic Germany, is sustained by them. They are striving to attain a new church constitution, in which laymen shall participate. This is now under consideration by the highest authorities, and will soon, without doubt, be realized. The party that advocates Evangelical Union, is based on the vital principles of the Reformation, and strives to evangelize the people and give them a place in the church; and it can not but influence the people and win the victory.

The one thousandth volume of Baron Tauchnitz's celebrated library is to be a memorial one, and the fittest book in the world is chosen for such a place—no less than the New Testament according to the English version, with the different readings of various Greek versions, and accepted translations, as foot-notes. This edition, which promises to be a very excellent one, will be under the editorship of Dr. Tischendorf.

A German translation, by Dr. Ferdinand Löwe, of Kreutzwald's *Esthonian fairy-tales*, with notes and additions by R. Köhler and A. Schiefner, is about to appear at Halle. The first intimation of the existence of these tales was given in the preface to the German translation of Kreutzwald's *Esthonian Sagas*, which was published at St. Petersburg in 1854. That they are at last about to become accessible, in a good translation, will be welcome news to the ever increasing number of students of comparative mythology and ethnology. The names of Schiefner and Köhler are a safe guarantee that, in the notes, not only the cognate Finnic literature, but also the wide range of Slavonic and Teutonic fairy stories, has been laid under contribution for any points of identity or resemblance, tending to illustrate the history of the growth and migration of the Esthonian tales.

*Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie*. ED. A. HILGENFELD, Professor in Jena, 1869. First Part. Professor Lipsius, of Kiel, on Schleiermacher's "*Dialectics*"—an able discussion of his fundamental philosophical positions; Holtzmann, *The relation of John to the Synoptical (first three) Gospels*—ingenious rather than profound; R. Spiegel, *Bp. Hardenberg's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*; with special respect to the view of Dr. H. Schmid, of Erlangen Egli, critical notes on special passages of the Old Testament.

Among the works recently published are: The fourth edition of Ritter & Preller, *Historia Philosophia Græca et Romana*—a very useful compend of the original texts; Von Polenz, *History of the French Calvinism*, Vol. V.

compiled with care, and indispensable; a second edition of Rothe's *Zur Dogmatik, on Revelation, Inspiration, etc.*; Dr. J. Lehmann, *The Clementina and their Relation to Christian Literature*; Dr. J. Carus, *History of Poland*. Vol. V., is the "*Staatengeschichte*," etc.; Dr. J. F. A. Mücke, *Flavius Claudius Julianus*, Vol. 2; the third volume of the second edition of Hupfeld's *Psalms*, edited by Riehm—philologically a thorough work; Böttiger's *History of Saxony*; second edition, edited by Dr. Flathe, Vol. 2; the *Life of Stier* by his two sons, in two vols.; Menke's *Bible Atlas*, published by Perthes, (3½ thlr.)—an excellent work, well brought out.

The so-called German mysticism is one of the most important theological tendencies, in the transition from the scholastic theology to the theology of the Reformation. It has hardly yet been fully recognized in all its import. It was, essentially, a protest of Christian experience against those scholastic formulas, by which Rome sought to bind faith to the traditions of the church. One of the best essays on this subject is a contribution by Professor Preger, of Munich, to the *Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theologie*, Part I., 1869, the only article in this number, entitled, "Preliminaries to a History of the German Mysticism, in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," developing the views of the Dominican Order, in Paris and Germany, viz.: those of Theodorich of Freiburg, of Eckhart, Henry of Nördlingen, Tauler, Suso, and of a "Friend of God from the Upper Land," etc. It is an instructive essay, and gives good promise for the fuller work on the subject which the author is preparing for publication. The transition from the scholastic theology to the Reformation was, in fact, much more directly made by these much-abused "mystics," than is generally supposed. Luther commended and translated the "*German Theology*," (translated into English by Miss Winkworth), in which is condensed the essence of this movement.

#### FRANCE.

The second volume of Herminjard's *Correspondence des Réformateurs*, (1527-1532) has been published at Geneva and Paris—pp. 504. It is a valuable collection of the documents by which history is to be tested. The first volume contained many letters of Lefevre d'Etaples, and Farel. The second volume has twenty-four letters of Farel; twenty-eight written to him; ten of the early letters of Calvin; letters of and to Zwingle, etc. These documents enable us to correct several current errors, including some of Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, in his "History of the Reformation in the time of Calvin." This is clearly shown in an instructive article by Mr. Killiemin, in the "*Revue Chrétienne*," Oct., 1868. The most striking of these is an inference made from a mis-reading of the first letter we have of Calvin, in 1530, (Sept. 6.) It is dated in the original, from Meillan, about ten leagues from Bourges. The name "Meillan" is transformed, in the Edinburgh translation of Calvin's letters, (republished by the Presbyterian Board in this country,) into "Meaux," which latter was the residence of Bishop Briçonnet. This mistake, it seems, led the historian of the Reformation to give a vivid account of a fictitious journey of Calvin to Meaux, and of an attempted conference with the Bishop, for which there is no authority.

M. Joseph Deranbourg has published (Imperial Printing Office,) an Essay on the History of Palestine, from Cyrus to Adrian, derived from long neglected Rabbinic sources. It is full of new and curious matter, and is highly recommended for its research by M. Renan.

Among the works lately published are: Abbé Castan, "The Origin of Christianity according to the Contemporary Rationalistic Criticism"; Henri Martin, "Galileo, the Rights of Science"; Abbé Démarey, "The Fourth Gospel"; F. Lenormant, "Manual of Ancient History", vol. 2; Jules Simon, "Radical Policy"; A. Carayon, "Inedited Documents about the Society of Jesus", vols. 15 and 16; Abbé Guérin, "Theological Sources—the General and Special Councils", to be in three vols., 21 f.; A. de Lamoignon, "The Camisards"; Ch. Poncet, "Plus V. at Valence"; Prevost Paradol, "The New France"; P. A. de Lambilly, "The Church and the Prophets," a commentary on the Apocalypae; the third volume of Count d'Haussonville's able work on "The Roman Church and the

First Empire," i. e. of Napoleon I., a work relating to the most intricate questions of relation of church and state.

*Annuaire Philosophique.* Par Louis-Auguste Martin. Tome V. Paris, 1868. A monthly journal of about 32 pages. It contains reports of the chief lectures on philosophical subjects, delivered in Paris and other cities; concise notices of new philosophical publications; and a bibliography of philosophical works. It represents a kind of "independent morality" as the basis of all speculation, and the end and aim of human life. It has no special speculative force, and is chiefly valuable for its literary record.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

Prof. Veitch has in preparation a Memoir of Sir William Hamilton. He was one of the editors of Hamilton's Posthumous Works. The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh, by Edwards, is published in two vols.,—based on contemporary documents. Brooke F. Westcott's History of the English Bible is published by MacMillan.

Dr. Halley, an eminent Independent minister, is about to publish a work entitled, "Lancashire,—its Puritanism and Non-conformity." He has been engaged upon it for several years.

Rev. Wm. Lambert has edited the "Canons of the First Four General Councils, with those of the Early Greek Synods"; in Greek, with Latin and revised English Translations, and Notes from the best canonists, (Zonaras, Balsamon, Bp. Beveridge, etc.) The work is published at 7s. 6d.

Dr. Littledale edits a new edition of the late Dr. J. M. Neale's reprint of the "Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil: or, according to the use of the Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople; and the Formula of the Apostolic Constitution." It is published, London, by J. T. Hayes. It contains the earliest liturgical documents, in the original Greek text. Price, 6s. Mr. Hayes also publishes a translation of these Liturgies.

Edmondstone & Douglas, Edinburgh, have published "Studies in Poetry and Philosophy," by J. C. Shurpe, Prof. of Humanity, St. Andrew's. pp. 443. These essays are reprinted from the North British Review. The subjects are, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keble, and the Moral Dynamic. The first three are biographical and critical, and exceedingly well done. The essay on Wordsworth, says an English critic, "is the most graceful, delicate, and perceptive (?) criticism we have ever met with." The whole series is, incidentally, a protest against the materialistic tendencies of the times. The last essay, entitled "The Moral Dynamic," sums up the argument, and shows that all moral systems, except the Christian, lack "a living, virtue-making power." The criticism on Keble is acknowledged by English churchmen to be the best yet produced in English literature. Those who read these articles in the North British will welcome them in their new form. They are well worthy of being republished.

The Bampton Lectures, 1868, by George Moberly, D. C. L., Canon of Chester, on "The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ," have been published: also, the Boyle Lectures for 1868, by Rev. Stanley Leathes, Prof. of Hebrew in King's College, on "The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ." Prof. Leathes has also recently published a Hebrew Grammar, which we elsewhere notice. The "*Ecce Deus*," which was published in part as a complement, and in part as a reply, to Prof. Seelye's "*Ecce Homo*," has reached a third edition, with the name of the author, Dr. Joseph Parker. The first edition was republished in Boston. Rev. E. A. Thomson, "The Four Evangelists, with the Distinctive Characteristics of their Gospels.—3s. 6d. Dr. Wayland's "Elements of Moral Science" has reached its eighth edition in England. Dr. James Hamilton's works are to be republished in six volumes—the first volume is out. Of Dr. Wordsworth's "Holy Bible, with Notes," the first part of vol. V. has been published, on Isaiah.—12s. 6d. Another "*Ecce*" has been published, "*Ecce Spiritus Opus*: the Church of Christ a Broad Church," by a Physician.—3s. 6d. In the series of English Reprints, the latest is "Lyly's Euphues," published at 4s.—a curious essay. The whole series is valuable, and well brought

out. A new edition of Morison's "Life and Times of St. Bernard" has been issued.—7a. 6d. The fifth volume of the translation of Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin," is announced by the Longmans. The second volume of Ewald's "History of Israel," translated by Prof. R. Martineau, extending to the death of Samuel, has been published. James H. Rigg, D. D., "The Relation of John Wesley and of Wesleyan Methodism to the Established Church."—2a. Vols. 3 and 4 of Spedding's Life and Letters of Lord Bacon.—24s. "England v. Rome," by H. B. Swete, of Caius College, Cambridge. John Henry Blunt, "The Reformation of the Church of England, A. D. 1514—1547," nearly ready. Garbett's Bampton Lectures on "The Dogmatic Faith," has reached a second and cheaper edition.

#### RUSSIA.

*The Orthodox Interlocutor*, a Russian religious journal, gives some interesting information respecting the circulation of Mahomedan books in Russia. At the end of the eighteenth century the Russian government printed 3,000 copies of the Koran in Arabic, and distributed them among the Mahomedans. In 1800 a Tartar printing-office was opened in Kazan, connected with the gymnasium there, under the charge of a certain Burashef. In the first three years 31,200 copies of Mahomedan religious books were printed. But in one book which Burashef printed, he introduced some passages in favor of the Shiite sect, against the express command of the Mufti, all the Mahomedans of Russia being Sunites. This book was burned in the presence of the mullahs and officials, Burashef and the censor being both dismissed. In 1828 the printing press of the University of Kazan obtained Asiatic script type, so that a still greater number of Mahomedan books were published. Between 1842 and 1852 the same press issued 23,600 copies of the Koran, and 44,300 copies of the seventh part, the Haftiak, besides many other books. Between 1855 and 1864, 1,084,320 copies of different Mahomedan religious book were issued by it. Other (private) printing offices were opened at Kazan by Tartars, and from 1853 to 1859 they printed 82,500 copies of the Koran alone; they are still issuing books, but later statistics are not given. These books are sold at the fairs, and also in the Crimea, the Caucasus, and through Central Asia. Of course the *Orthodox Interlocutor* expresses regret at this freedom of religious opinion. In connection with the above we quote the following, which, we think, must also refer to Arabic or Tartar books, as there could scarcely be 350,000 purchasers of Russian books in all the dominions of the Czar: "The *Novaya Vremaya*, a Russian journal, gives some interesting information concerning the number and quality of the publications issued from the St. Petersburg and Moscow press. The market supplies an enormous quantity of books, each issue of which ranges from 10,000 to 25,000 copies, and reaches seldom less than three editions, and often as many as fifteen, so that on an average each book finds a sale of from 30,000 to 350,000 copies. This commerce is carried on chiefly in the two capitals, and is entirely in the hands of a class of booksellers and publishers who are far too greedy speculators to care about the good or evil tendency of the volumes they put into circulation. Hence the country is inundated with inferior publications, ill calculated to convey useful information or to elevate the popular intelligence. But they find a wide circle of readers, to whose grossest instincts and prejudices they pander, while there is little or no call for respectable standard works. Accordingly, to aid, if possible, the intellectual and moral progress of the people, the *Vremaya* would recommend the formation of a society to be composed of the publishers of cheap popular literature, in conjunction with scientific and literary men, the chief object of which would be to regulate and superintend the publication of books destined for the use of the lower classes."

A valuable collection of Chinese books and manuscripts, consisting of about 11,607 works, together with 1,000 rare and unique wood engravings, are about to be sold at St. Petersburg, by M. Sskatschkow, Russian counsellor of State, who has been fifteen years forming it. It is said that various Russian societies have endeavored to raise means to purchase it, and it will even fall to an American for 225,000 francs.

THE  
AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN  
REVIEW.

---

THIRD SERIES. No. III.—JULY, 1869.

---

ART. I.—MR. MILL AND HIS CRITICS.

By FRANCIS BOWEN, Professor in Harvard University.

SECOND PAPER.

"MATTER, then," says Mr. Mill, according to his "Psychological Theory," "may be defined a Permanent Possibility of Sensation. If I am asked whether I believe in matter, I ask whether the questioner accepts this definition of it. If he does, I believe in matter; and so do all *Berkeleians*. In any other sense than this, I do not. But I affirm with confidence, that this conception of Matter *includes the whole meaning attached to it by the common world*, apart from philosophical, and sometimes from theological, theories."

Here is an implied assertion, that his definition of Matter coincides with Berkeley's doctrine of Idealism, and a direct assertion, that it includes the whole meaning attached to the conception of Matter by ordinary people, who are neither philosophers nor theologians. We dispute both positions. Bishop Berkeley affirms the necessity of a Cause, an Efficient Cause, to account for the ideas or sensations in our minds; and as he says "there is nothing of power or agency" in the ideas themselves, as "it is impossible for an idea to do anything, or, strictly speaking, to be the cause of anything," he has a right to conclude, as he does, "there is therefore some cause of these ideas, whereon they depend, and which pro-



duces and changes them." This cause he elsewhere affirms to be a mind or spirit, since he can have "no notion of any action distinct from volition, neither can I conceive of volition to be anywhere but in a spirit;" therefore, "I assert as well as you, that since we are affected from without, we must allow powers to be without in a being distinct from ourselves." The ideas imprinted on my senses, he argues further, "are not creatures of my will; there is, therefore, some other will or spirit that produces them." Berkeleyan Idealism, then, affirms the principle of causality, and thereby proves the existence of a Not-Self,—of a Divine mind, and other human minds besides my own; it denies material substance, but affirms spiritual causation and the efficiency of volition. Mr. Mill repudiates Efficient Causation altogether; and by admitting the existence only of Sensations and Possibilities of Sensation, he unpeoples the universe, and leaves his single "thread of consciousness" alone in creation. Berkeley spiritualizes Matter; Mill annihilates it.

The progenitor and sponsor of Mill's system is not Bishop Berkeley, but David Hume, who taught that "nothing is ever present to the mind but perceptions," and that "it is impossible for us to conceive or form an idea of anything specifically different from ideas and impressions." Setting aside some metaphysicians, he thinks he "may venture to affirm of the rest of mankind, that they are nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement." "The mind," he affirms, "is a kind of theatre, where several perceptions successively make their appearance, pass, repass, glide away, and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations. There is properly no *simplicity* in it at one time, nor *identity* in different [times]; whatever natural propension we may have to imagine that simplicity and identity. The comparison of the theatre must not mislead us. *They are the successive perceptions only that constitute the mind*; nor have we the most distant notion of the place where these scenes are represented, or of the materials of which it is composed."



Just as little can the "Psychological Theory" be sheltered under the common opinion on this subject entertained by the vulgar. Ordinary people certainly attribute their sensations to some Cause operating upon their organs from without; and this Cause they believe to be *something*, they know not what, the unknown seat or substratum of the qualities which affect their senses. The notions of Efficient Cause and Substance, far from being mere "metaphysical entities" excogitated by a few philosophers and theologians, must be classed among the most primitive and familiar impressions and beliefs of the great bulk of mankind. Mr. Mill's doctrine is the metaphysical refinement; that which he impugns is the common belief of all men, except a few philosophers.

Whatever evidence there may be, on the ordinary or Intuitional theory, "that I have any fellow creatures, or that there are any Selves except mine," says Mr. Mill, "exactly that same evidence is there" of the existence of these other Selves on the Psychological Theory. We deny that his doctrine affords him any such evidence, or even authorizes him to trust his memory, to admit his own personal identity, or to entertain any expectation whatever. If we know nothing but sensations or feelings, occurring singly or in groups, together with their sequences, coexistences and similitudes, and are not at liberty to assume any *cause* for these phenomena, other than their invariable antecedents and concomitants, then we can not *know* even the poor "*thread* of consciousness" to which Mr. Mill has reduced his own individual being. His own Mind may be a string of beads, but it is one which is constantly slipping through his fingers, since he grasps it only by one bead at a time, neither the past nor the future being in any manner *present* to consciousness. We have no better right to infer the actual existence of the Past from a present consciousness which merely *represents* that Past, than we have to infer the existence of the table, as an external reality, from the consciousness of the sensations which we believe the table excites. On this point, Hume is consistent and logical, while Mill is the reverse. If Perception, which is a continuous phenomenon, the sensations abiding till we voluntarily turn

away from the object that produces them,—if Perception, we say, plays us false, what better guaranty have we of the faithfulness of Memory, which is avowedly nothing but a mental picture, a mere representative image, and comparatively a faint one, of what is past and gone? The cardinal feature of Mr. Mill's theory is, that a phenomenon avouches incontestably nothing but its own phenomenal existence and characteristics. We might as well admit our own causative energy, though, according to Mr. Mill, we have direct evidence only of the effects produced by it, as admit the reality of a Past, of which only an adumbration now floats before consciousness. The irresistible character of the belief which accompanies it is no valid evidence before the court where Mr. Mill presides; such testimony, in the case of Perception, he rules out without ceremony.

Besides the permanent group of Possibilities of Sensation, which he calls his own body, Mr. Mill argues that there are other similar groups, representing other human bodies, each exhibiting a set of phenomena such as he knows, in his own case, to be effects of consciousness, "and such as might be looked for if each of the bodies has really in connexion with it a world of consciousness." But, to him, these groups are only forms of the Ego, and can not be resolved into a Non-Ego, except by admitting the doctrine of Efficient Causation, or of immediate perception, or of that irresistible but inexplicable belief which is only another name for *knowledge*, or of an *a priori* law of thought. Through dwelling upon the doctrine that Matter is only a name for an aggregate of possible sensations, he has so far objectified the group in his own conception of it, as to forget the subjective character of all the elements of which it is composed. But it is objectified only in thought; it is a mere subject-object. A Possibility of Sensation is only his *expectation*, (a pure state of his own mind,) that the given Sensation, (another mental state,) will revive under certain circumstances.

Mr. Mill was betrayed into the inconsistency of admitting "memories and expectations" into that thread of consciousness which composes the mind's phenomenal life, through the

exigencies of the case; for, of course, without remembrance and anticipation, no inductive reasoning would be possible, and there would be no experience beyond that of the present moment. This is the gulf of utter scepticism into which Hume willingly plunged; Mr. Mill struggles bravely to get out of it, but his own consistency must be sacrificed before he can gain foothold on the solid ground above. For what are these "memories and expectations?" "In themselves," he rightly says (p. 241), "they are present feelings, states of present consciousness, and in that respect not distinguished from sensations." But he adds, "They all, moreover, *resemble some given sensations or feelings, of which we have previously had experience*;" and each of them, also, "*involves a belief in more than its own present existence.*"

*How does Mr. Mill know that they "resemble" some of our former sensations, since these previous phenomena are not now before us? And what guaranty has he of the validity of that "belief," by which they are accompanied? True, they affirm such resemblance, and assert this belief. But Mr. Mill, in other cases, has refused even to listen to such allegations. The presence of the sensation is an immediate datum of consciousness; but the validity of any knowledge, assertion or belief implied in that sensation, or inseparably associated with it, is not an immediate datum of consciousness, and can not be admitted without building up again that real objective world, both of Matter and Mind, which the "Psychological Theory" has resolved into a mere dream. There is no reason, then, why Mr. Mill should hesitate, at the last moment, to carry out his theory of the Mind or Ego to its farthest consequences. There is no "inexplicable fact" in the case. The presence of alleged "memories and expectations" in the series ought not to have perplexed him, any more than the presence of alleged "perceptions."*

We can learn that another mind is acting near us only from sensible evidence of the presence and actions of another body—a tall, featherless biped—now affecting our faculties of sight and touch. Taking for granted the actual existence of this biped, Mr. Mill argues that the similarity of its outward form

and actions to those of my own body, and my consciousness that *my* actions are connected with *my* thoughts and volitions, authorize me to conclude, by legitimate inductive evidence, that the biped's actions are connected with *his* thoughts; that he, also, has a Mind. Furthermore, he affirms, that having supposed the biped possesses thoughts and feelings similar to my own, "I find that my subsequent consciousness presents those very sensations, of speech heard, of movements and other outward demeanor seen, and so forth, which, being the effects or consequents of actual feelings in my own case, I should expect to follow upon those other hypothetical feelings [of the biped], if they really exist; and thus the hypothesis is verified."

But this argument is open to two fatal objections.

1. What right have I to take for granted the real presence before me of one mass of matter—the biped,—when I deny the real presence of another aggregation of matter—the desk,—the evidence for the existence of the two being avowedly the same,—namely, the existence of a group of sensations, and believed possibilities of sensations, in my own mind; or, rather, the existence of them *somewhere*, though in no definite locality; since Mr. Mill is by no means sure of the reality of his own Mind or Self, and does not believe the real externality to us of anything, "except other minds?" It seems a paradoxical distinction, by the by, to assert the externality—that is, the existence in space—of other *minds*, and to deny the externality of all *bodies*, his own included.

2. The correspondence of the relation between the observed actions and supposed feelings of the biped with the relation between my own actions and feelings can be affirmed only on the ground of my *remembrance* of the manner in which I acted and was affected on a previous occasion, when the circumstances were similar. To borrow an illustration adopted by Mr. Mill from one of his critics, if the biped screams when he cuts his finger, I can infer that he feels pain, only because I remember what my own feelings were, some time ago, when I experienced a similar accident. But Memory, we repeat, is a witness that has been turned out of court, and can not bear

witness to the similarity either of the feelings, or of the circumstances that generated the feelings.

Mr. Mill repeatedly charges his critics with inability to think themselves fully into the theory which they deny, or to form that accurate and entire conception of it which is necessary before it can be fairly judged. We fear the accusation may be retorted; for it does not seem that he himself is always fully aware of the narrowness of the basis on which his theory rests, and of the consequent difficulty of enlarging it enough to meet all the exigencies of the case. He does not always remember that, to him, the universe must be contained within the limits of his own consciousness at any one moment. He has before him, not a record of the whole, or any considerable portion, of the history of his consciousness, but only an almost momentary glimpse of its condition and contents at the instant of observation, this picture fading out entirely when succeeded by another of the series. That some of these states of his own mind report themselves, when thus observed, as "memories" and "expectations," is a fact of no more importance than the corresponding one, that others give themselves out, with equal strength of assertion, as "internal" and "external" states of consciousness, or as forms of the Ego or the Non-Ego. He must admit that imagination can simulate the Past at least as perfectly as the Present. The "expectation" can not even be justified by the subsequent event; for when that event comes round, the expectation of it already exists only in memory.

Let us now go back for a moment to Mr. Mill's doctrine of empiricism,—to his attempt to account for the presence of necessary and universal truths in the human mind, not by tracing them, after the manner of Leibnitz and Kant, to *a priori* laws of human thought, but by trying to generate them from experience through the law of Inseparable Association. It is unlucky that he allows himself to be so far heated by opposition as to lose caution in the statement of his extreme opinions, and to express himself in a tone of far more confident dogmatism about those doctrines which he espouses against the authority of nearly all the great metaphysicians of an ear-

T

TE

Ne

on  
esp

kel  
ass  
ev  
e e

adi

ir  
cur

er  
er  
U

Th  
Th  
a

s

s

R  
a  
R

r



# THE MASON & HAMLIN ORGANS,

THE ACKNOWLEDGED STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE  
AMONG INSTRUMENTS OF THE CLASS,

**At Prices of Inferior Work.**

New Inventions, New Styles, Greatly Reduced Prices; A first-class ORGAN for \$50; Lowest Prices printed and alike to all; New Illustrated Catalogue.

THE MASON & HAMLIN ORGAN CO., winners of the Paris Exposition Medal, and Seventy-five other highest premiums for superiority, respectfully announce:

1. The introduction in several styles of their organs of a new invention which is likely to prove the most popular improvement ever produced in instruments of this class. It is the MASON & HAMLIN IMPROVED VOX HUMANA, and excels every previous attachment to such instruments in the novelty, variety and beauty of its effects, the ease with which it is used, and its freedom from liability to get out of order.

2. The introduction of new styles of organs, with important improvements, including new and elegant designs in cases.

3. A Material Reduction in Prices, and rigid adherence to the policy of *printing* their lowest prices, which are therefore alike to all, and subject to no discount. This ensures to every purchaser the lowest price.

The Company's perfected machinery and accumulated facilities enable them to offer their well-known organs at prices as low or even less than those demanded for inferior work.

OUR OCTAVE ORGAN, Solid Walnut Case, plain, . . . . .	\$50
OUR OCTAVE ORGAN, Solid Walnut Case, Carved and Paneled, . . . . .	100
OUR OCTAVE DOUBLE REED ORGAN, FIVE STOPS, with tremulant and knee-swell, Solid Walnut Case, Carved and Paneled, . . . . .	125
same, SIX STOPS, with manual sub-bass, . . . . .	150
same, SEVEN STOPS, with manual sub-bass and octave coupler, . . . . .	175
OUR OCTAVE DOUBLED-REED CABINET ORGAN, FIVE STOPS, and the exquisite Mason & Hamlin Improved Vox Humana, in elegant Paneled & Carved Walnut Case, the best organ of its size which can be made, . . . . .	170

Many other styles at proportionate prices. New Catalogue and Descriptive Circular sent free. Address

THE MASON & HAMLIN ORGAN CO.,  
596 Broadway, New York.

**Traphagan, Hunter & Co.,**  
**POPULAR CLOTHIERS,**  
**398, 400, and 402 Bowery,**

*Junction of 3d and 4th Aves. opp. 6th St.*

Gentlemen's, Youth's, and Children's

**CLOTHING**

OF SUPERIOR STYLE AND QUALITY,

**READY-MADE AND TO ORDER.**

---

**READY-MADE DEPARTMENT**

*IS STOCKED WITH THE*

*Newest and most Fashionable Styles.*

---

**CUSTOM DEPARTMENT,**

*UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE*

**Best and most Experienced Cutters.**

---

**Boys' and Children's Department,**

Entirely separate from the Gent's, and comprises every style and quality of Garment, suitable for all ages from two years up.

**Most liberal Discounts offered to the Trade**  
**FOR CASH**